

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, March, 1890.

## SEVENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION.

In its Seventh Annual Convention the Modern Language Association of America met for the second time in New England, but for the first time at Harvard University. At the opening session on Thursday evening, December 26, 1889, Sever Hall was filled with an appreciative audience, including many citizens of Cambridge and Boston, who had assembled to listen to the opening addresses. President LOWELL of the Association introduced President ELIOT of Harvard University with a gracefully worded tribute to his great and manifold services to the University.

In welcoming the members of the Convention to Harvard University, President ELIOT said that no seat of learning in the country could give them a more sympathetic greeting, or might more appropriately receive the honor of their presence. It was there that, in 1816, the first professorship of modern languages in this country was founded, a chair which at once took equal rank with all the other professorships in the university. No other chair in America, no matter of what subject, has ever had such a series of incumbents as this chair of modern languages. It was first held by GEORGE TICKNOR, next by HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW, and next by the President of the Modern Language Association. In the later development of the university modern languages have had their full share. The chief object of attention has been the promotion of English. The staff of instructors in that subject alone is now as large as an entire college faculty of twenty-five years ago. President ELIOT also spoke of the interest which the university had taken in promoting the study of English in the secondary schools. In 1874 was established an examination in English for admission to Harvard College; that examination has since been adopted by all other New England colleges save one, and by many colleges in other parts of the country. In 1875 an admission examination in French

or German was established; and in 1887 French and German were put upon a par with Latin, Greek, Mathematics, and all other subjects, in the examination for admission to college. President ELIOT concluded his remarks by inviting the members of the convention to a reception to be given at his house at the close of the meeting; by extending an invitation on the part of the President and Fellows to lunch at Memorial Hall on Friday and Saturday; and by bidding them a hearty welcome to Harvard University.

The address of the President of the Association was listened to throughout with the keenest interest. Among the founders of Harvard, said Mr. LOWELL, were doubtless many "who believed that nothing written in any living tongue could itself live." Until recently modern languages have been held in low esteem; for nearly two hundred years no French was taught at Harvard, and modern languages were first taught for the sake of their commercial value. Holding a brief for modern languages, Mr. LOWELL proceeded to show that for purposes of literary culture and linguistic discipline they have an equal value with the classics, "if pursued with the same thoroughness and to the same end." He spoke of the benefit to be derived from translation, as also of the difficulty of rendering the real meaning, the soul of a passage. SPENSER's saying,

"For of the soule the bodie forme doth take;  
For soule is forme, and doth the bodie make,"

is true of the highest genius; but soul gives not only form, it also gives life. This is genius in literature; some poets, whose work is lacking in form, are full of this life-giving power. In closing, he spoke of the wonderful advances made in the philology of the modern languages: yet insisted that "good as is this study of philology in itself, it should lead to something better, and that something better is literature. The blossoms of a language are certainly of as much value as the roots, for if the roots transmit life to the plant, it is the blossoms only that produce the seeds whereby that life is developed and renewed in their growths." One is tempted to transfer from their

setting a few of the sparkling "jewels five-words-long" with which the address was thickly studded: "It is not the language in which a man writes, but what he has made that language say, that has the power of resisting decay." Referring to 'Aucassin et Nicolette': "That unconscious charm which is beyond all else, but which belongs to the early maidenhood of a language. If this be not style, it is something better than style." "A foreign language plays the poet for us by putting things in a new light." "Delight is a duty of whatever deserves the name of literature." "There is a nine-fold choice among the Muses; Happiness is one of them, and she does not wear the doctor's cap." "The best result of the study of the ancients was the begetting of the moderns." "The masters of prose in whatever tongue teach the same lesson and exact the same fee." "Literature is nothing else than the autobiography of mankind." To quote all the delightful sayings in this address would be to quote the greater part of it; the brief summary which is all that can be given in this report, fails to convey an adequate idea of the rare pleasure experienced by all who were so fortunate as to hear it. The cause of modern languages has never been presented more effectively or more winningly than from the lips of one who is the embodiment of the culture and scholarship to be gained from modern languages.

The opening session on Friday morning was called to order by the second Vice-President, Professor CALVIN THOMAS, who also presided at the afternoon session. The yearly reports of the Secretary, Professor A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT, and of the Treasurer, Dr. HENRY A. TODD, were read and approved; committees were appointed upon the nomination of officers for the ensuing year, to decide upon the place for holding the next Convention, to audit the Treasurer's accounts, and to present resolutions upon the death of Professor ZDANOWICZ. The Secretary reported to the Association the non-performance of contract on the part of the stenographer who had been engaged to report the proceedings at Cincinnati in 1888.

The printed syllabus that was mailed with the programme of the meetings was most serviceable, in that it presented clearly the im-

portant points in the papers read. As this syllabus was sent to every member of the Association, it will be sufficient to indicate the general trend of the discussions, without attempting to give a full and detailed account of the papers.

The first paper was "The Relation of SHAKESPEARE to 'The Taming of the Shrew,'" by Professor TOLMAN of Ripon College; in his absence the paper was read by the present writer, who also opened the discussion. The relation of "The Taming of the Shrew" to "The Taming of a Shrew," and the relation of both plays to GASCOIGNE's translation of ARIOSTO's "Supposes," were clearly traced. Taking as a starting-point COLLIER's suggestion "that SHAKESPEARE had little to do with any of the scenes in which Katherine and Petruchio are not engaged," and GRANT WHITE's statement that "all the scenes in which Katherine and Petruchio and Grumio are the prominent figures" belong to SHAKESPEARE, an attempt was made to separate the Shakespearian from the non-Shakespearian parts of the play. The results thus obtained were confirmed by verse-tests, and by an examination of the style and dramatic fitness of the passages. Correspondences were noted between the plays of ROBERT GREENE and the non-Shakespearian parts of the play, and the conjecture was advanced that GREENE was the collaborator with SHAKESPEARE in writing "The Taming of the Shrew." In the discussion attention was called to the careful manner in which Professor TOLMAN had separated proof and conjecture. Reasons were adduced to show that GREENE could not have had any part in writing "The Taming of the Shrew." The discussion was continued by Professors STODDARD (University of the City of New York) and WOOD (Johns Hopkins University).

The second paper read was "A Forerunner of BUNYAN in the Twelfth Century," by Professor FRANCKE of Harvard University. The writer showed that there was a current of didactic allegory beginning with the "Architrenius" in the twelfth century and ending with BUNYAN in the seventeenth century. A brief account of such mediæval poems in Germany and England was followed by a detailed

account of the "Architrenius," an unpublished poem in Latin by JEAN DE ANVILLE. Attention was called to the opposition to the church of Rome, to the democratic spirit of the poem, and to the tendency toward humanistic culture; thus marking this work with others of a similar character as precursors of the Renaissance and of the Reformation. The discussion was opened by Professor STODDARD, who raised the question as to the value which the study of the Middle Ages has for pupils; he found the answer to be in the spirit of unity that runs through all literature. Professor WOOD said that the didactic allegory of the twelfth century was democratic in spirit in that it preferred the city life of the people to the country life of the nobles. Professor COHN (Harvard University) said that we must judge of the tendency of a poem by the measure of success, and instanced the very great success of JEAN DE MEUNG's part of the 'Roman de la Rose,' which is strongly democratic. Attention was called by another speaker to the fact that the democratic spirit assumed two phases of opposition, (1) to religious power, (2) to temporal power. Professors ELLIOTT (Johns Hopkins University), BRANDT (Hamilton College) GERBER (Earlham College), Drs. BRIGHT, WARREN, LEARNED (John Hopkins University) and GREENE (Cathedral School of Saint Paul) also took part in the discussion, perhaps the most animated and spontaneous that has ever been called forth by any paper presented to the Association.

By a slight change in the programme, the next paper was "WILLIAM THORNTON, a Phonetic Pioneer," by Professor WRIGHT of Middlebury College. He named three pioneers in phonetics, FRANKLIN, NOAH WEBSTER and THORNTON, of whom the last named is by far the most important. In THORNTON's "Cadmus," published in the Transactions of the American Philosophical Society for 1793, is an elaborate phonetic alphabet. His system was compared with those of SWEET and BELL, and attention was called to various points wherein he anticipated the investigations of later and better known phoneticians. In opening the discussion, Professor BRANDT said that the paper showed that the movement for spelling reform was not

new, and that a radical reform was impossible, except for scientific purposes. Dr. PRIMER (Friends School) spoke of the difference in intonation (acoustic color, *Klangfarbe*) between the battle-yells of the Northern and Southern armies during the civil war. This point was commented upon by Dr. LYMAN (Baltimore), and Dr. BRIGHT, who instanced the uniformity of tone of a town or of a nation. Professor A. MELVILLE BELL (Washington, D. C.), Professor ELLIOTT and Mr. SPANHOOF (St. Paul's School) also took part in the discussion.

The first paper read at the afternoon session was "Of the Use of the Negation by CHAUCER, with particular reference to *ne* (*non*)," by Professor KENT of the University of Tennessee. The writer called attention to the two uses in CHAUCER of *ne* (*non*) and *nē* (*neque*); he then took up the uses of *ne* in independent sentences, in the various kinds of dependent sentences, in multiplied negations, and in various metrical positions. While *nē* frequently receives the ictus, it cannot be clearly established that *ne* ever receives it. This paper, which gave evidence of most careful investigation, was discussed by Dr. BRIGHT, Professor WHITE (Cornell University), and Professor THOMAS (University of Michigan).

Dr. DODGE of Columbia College then read an historical sketch of "Scandinavian Lexicography," based upon material which he had collected in the Royal and University Libraries at Copenhagen. Modern Danish lexicography owes its origin to MATHIAS MOTH, statesman and scholar; his dictionary is still in manuscript. MOLBECH took Dr. JOHNSON for his model: his dictionary is literary rather than scientific. The best Danish-English dictionary is that of LARSEN, 1881; the best English-Danish dictionary, that of ROSING, 1853. The Danish dictionary published by TAUCHNITZ is very poor. Orthography in Denmark is still in an unsettled state: the great needs at present are a standard dictionary, an etymological dictionary, and a complete dialect dictionary. The paper was commented upon by Dr. GROTH of Brooklyn, who also gave a brief account of dictionaries in Norwegian.

The last paper was read by Dr. PRIMER of the Friends School, Providence, on "The



Pronunciation of Fredericksburg, Virginia." The first part of the paper presented a sketch of the early settlements in Virginia, of the early families, and of the careful education of their sons in England. FREEMAN's remark was quoted, that "good West Saxon is still spoken in Orange County, Virginia." An account of dialectic peculiarities of the present day was then given; in the subsequent discussion it was found that many of these peculiarities are widespread, that only a few can be called local. Attention was also called to the peculiar *timbre* or *Klangfarbe* of Fredericksburg and of the entire South as contrasted with the North. The discussion was opened by Professor JOYNES (University of South Carolina), whose school-days were spent near Fredericksburg; he made a few corrections in minor points, and insisted upon the great influence of William and Mary College in maintaining a high standard of education. Professors MATZKE (Bowdoin College), VAN DAELL (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), and THOMAS, also took part in the discussion.

President LOWELL presided over both sessions of Saturday. At the beginning of the morning session, Dr. BRIGHT moved that in recognition of the presence of the President and of the President of the Phonetic Section, the Association meet as one body instead of sitting in two sections, as had been planned. This motion was carried, to the great satisfaction of those who are learners in phonetics, but whose interest would not have been such as to lead them to forego the regular meeting.

The Association listened with much interest to the address of the veteran phonetician, A. MELVILLE BELL, President of the Phonetic Section. He spoke of the ease of imitation in childhood as contrasted with the difficulty which adults find in learning a new language, owing to their lack of phonetic training. What is called combination of sounds is merely a rapid sequence. The only difficult thing in English pronunciation is accent, or syllabic light and shade. The difficulty in pronouncing foreign languages is due to a neglect to study them phonetically. There is a need of absolute characters in phonetics: the attempt to interpret letters by other letters is always a

failure. President BELL gave an interesting account of his experiments with "Visible Speech" before ALEXANDER J. ELLIS, author of 'Early English Pronunciation'; also of similar experiments with "Glossotype," made in Cambridge twenty years ago.

Dr. LEARNED of Johns Hopkins University then read a paper on "The Saga of WALTER OF AQUITAINE." The writer dealt (1) with the various sources of the saga, and (2) with its interpretation; he showed that it had an historical basis, and owed its origin to the events of the Folkwandering, though some confusion of names and dates has perhaps crept in, as frequently occurs in oral transmission. Professor FRANCKE, who opened the discussion, raised the question whether the Waltherius was original with EKKEHARD, or a translation from a Latin original, and spoke of the resemblance in style to PRUDENTIUS. Dr. LEARNED answered that the Waltari-Lied was an original legend given to EKKEHARD; and said further that peculiarities of style had been traced to VERGIL also. The discussion was continued by Professors WOOD and HENNEMAN (Hampden-Sidney College).

The next paper was on "Vowel Measurements," by Mr. GRANDGENT of Cambridge. While the formation of consonants is understood with approximate accuracy, the position of the vocal organs in producing the vowels is not so well known. What is needed is close observation of their own dialect by competent observers; and that some means be devised by which the shapes of the various organs of speech can be accurately measured without interfering with the natural utterance of the vowels. These measurements must be applied to the various positions of the soft palate, tongue, jaw, and lips, the organs which modify the vowel sound after it has left the larynx. No attempt will be made in this report to describe the extremely ingenious and interesting experiments by which Mr. GRANDGENT has endeavored to supply this need; for a full account, with accompanying plates illustrating the different vowel-positions, the reader is referred to the paper upon its publication. President BELL, in opening the discussion, said that this method of investigation was entirely new to him, as he had



learned to depend wholly upon the ear. President LOWELL, Professors COHN, THOMAS, STODDARD, JOYNES, Drs. BRIGHT and LYMAN, and Mr. SPANHOOFD, took part in the subsequent discussion, which turned chiefly upon the question, raised by Dr. BRIGHT, whether nasality can properly be called an American characteristic: Mr. GRANDGENT thought it was due to the sluggishness of the soft palate.

The last paper of the morning session was by Professor GERBER of Earlham College, on "Russian Animal Folk-lore Compared with the Mediæval Animal Epics of the West." This was a more extended study of the subject upon which Professor GERBER read a paper last year. Russian folk-lore, which is little influenced by literature, was compared with the folk-lore of Eastern nations and more carefully with the folk-lore of the West. The Slavic peoples are much interested in animal epics as stories, apart from the moral. The local coloring in these tales is very pronounced. Owing to the length of the morning session there was no discussion upon this paper.

The members of the Association lunched at Memorial Hall, as on Friday, by invitation of the President and Fellows of Harvard College. During the intermission many visited the house of the poet LONGFELLOW, on the invitation of his daughter, Miss ALICE LONGFELLOW; a number visited the rooms of the Fine Arts Department, which contained a large collection of photographs illustrating the development of Gothic architecture. Mention should also be made of the courtesies extended to the Association by the St. Botolph Club and by the Hasty Pudding Club.

The afternoon session was called to order shortly after three o'clock. Professor JOYNES, chairman of the committee on nominating officers for the ensuing year, presented the following list, which was unanimously adopted:

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, President, Harvard Univ.  
A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT, Sec'y, Johns Hopkins Univ.  
HENRY ALFRED TODD, Treas., Johns Hopkins Univ.

**EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:**

THE PRESIDENT, } *Ex-Officio*.  
THE SECRETARY, }  
THE TREASURER, }

GEORGE A. BARTLETT, Harvard University.  
HORATIO S. WHITE, Cornell University.  
ROSALIE SÉE, Wellesley College.

EDWARD S. JOYNES, University of South Carolina.  
ALCÉE FORTIER, Tulane University of Louisiana.  
CHARLES W. KENT, University of Tennessee.  
JAMES M. HART, University of Cincinnati.  
MELVILLE B. ANDERSON, Iowa University.  
ADOLPH GERBER, Earlham College.

**PHONETIC SECTION:**

*President*, A. MELVILLE BELL, Washington, D. C.  
*Secretary*, CHARLES H. GRANDGENT, Cambridge, Mass.

**PEDAGOGICAL SECTION:**

*President*, CHARLES E. FAY, Tufts College.  
*Secretary*, ALPHONSE N. VAN DAELL, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

**EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:**

CALVIN THOMAS, University of Michigan.  
PHILIPPE B. MARCOU, University of Michigan.

Professor BRANDT, for the committee on choice of place for the next meeting, reported in favor of Chicago or Nashville. After some discussion, upon the motion of Professor JOYNES the final choice was left to the Executive Council, who were not limited, however, to the places named above. The Committee on auditing the Treasurer's accounts, Professor SHELDON, chairman, reported that the accounts were correct.

Dr. PRIMER, chairman of the committee for presenting resolutions on the death of Professor ZDANOWICZ, read the following resolutions, which were adopted by a rising vote: "Whereas, since our last meeting, death has taken from us Professor CASIMIR ZDANOWICZ, we desire to place on record our heartfelt sorrow at the loss of our esteemed colleague. His qualities, both social and intellectual, were such as to win love and admiration. With keen intellectual powers and a zealous devotion to his literary and philological work, he had the remarkable gift of inspiring students with true fondness for study and a love of high and thorough scholarship. Therefore be it resolved:

1. That by his death we have lost a colleague whom we respected for his ability and integrity, and whom we loved for his never-failing courtesy and geniality;
2. That the members of this Association extend to the family of the deceased the sincere expression of their sympathy in the severe affliction which it has been called to suffer;
3. That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the widow of the deceased.

Professor JOYNES moved resolutions of thanks to the President and Fellows, and

Officers and Faculty, of Harvard College, to the Local Committee, and "to all who in any way have done us good or wished us well." These resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Association.

The first two papers read at this session were those in the phonetic section left over from the morning session. Dr. MARCOU of the University of Michigan read a paper on the "Influence of the Weakness of Accent-stress on Phonetic Change in French." He spoke of the possibility of distinguishing a language, at a distance from the speaker, by the speech-waves as determined by the presence or absence of marked accent. Briefly, the view advanced in this paper was that there was a strong tonic accent in Latin as there is now in Italian: the accent is less strongly marked in Spanish and in Provençal, and least of all in French. The writer inferred that there was a weaker accent in the languages of Northern Gaul than in Latin, thus producing a tendency to shorten post-tonic syllables in the pronunciation of Low Latin. Hence the post-tonic syllables readily disappeared as contracted, so that French words accent the last syllable, except where there is a so-called mute *e*. This lack of marked accent causes the even flow in French, so that the language is commonly supposed to have no accent. Upon the motion of Dr. BRIGHT the discussion upon this paper was combined with that on the following paper.

Professor MATZKE of Bowdoin College then read an abstract of a paper on "Dialect Peculiarities in the Development of *l mouillé* in Old French." The writer first indicated the orthography of *l mouillé* in Norman, Picard, Wallonian, Lorraine, and Champagne manuscripts, and its pronunciation in combination with various vowel sounds. He then considered the rise of *z* after *l mouillé* as a flectional sign (for *s*). For this investigation and the author's conclusions the reader is referred to the printed paper. In opening the discussion upon the two papers, Professor SHELDON suggested as a possible explanation for the weakness of accent-stress in French, that Old French may have had a stronger accent than modern French. The discussion

was continued by Professors VAN DAELL (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), COHN and MATZKE, and by Mr. GRANDGENT.

The third paper, on "Reading in Modern Language Study," was read by Professor JOYNES of the University of South Carolina. The principal points in this paper were that the power to read is the most important thing in studying French and German, and that students should read larger amounts of these languages. The immediate aim in language study should be (1) translation, which should not be decried, and (2) the power to read without translating. A distinction was made between those things which may properly be taught in the college class-room, and those which belong to university work. The reader uttered a word of warning against too much erudition in the class-room, and the temptation to intellectual pride; and said that "he who would lead children, in scholarship as in faith, must himself become as a little child." On the motion of Professor THOMAS, the discussion on this paper was combined with that on the following paper.

The last thing upon the programme was an extempore address by Professor FAY of Tufts College, who gave a history of the attempt on the part of the Commission of New England Colleges to unify the requirements for admission. This Commission first turned its attention to requirements in English, and its object has in the main been accomplished. The desire at present is to bring about uniform requirements in French and German. For this purpose a schedule of requirements in both languages had been drafted, and was distributed in the convention as a basis for general debate and criticism. An animated discussion ensued, in which Presidents LOWELL and ELIOT, Professors COHN, THOMAS, FAY, WHITE, VAN DAELL and others took part. Professor BARTLETT, Miss BOTH-HENDRIKSEN, and Mr. GRANDGENT criticised severely the list of works presented; Professor BARTLETT spoke of the importance of sight-reading of prose writers.

A pleasant feature of the session of Friday afternoon was the reception of a telegram of

congratulation, from President FRANKLIN CARTER of Williams College, formerly President of the Association. Toward the close of the last session a telegram was received from Professors HART, SCHILLING, and EGGERS, of the Modern Language Association of Ohio, sending greetings to the parent association; on the motion of Dr. LEARNED greetings were returned. Thus ended a most enjoyable and profitable convention; the presence of President LOWELL, and his address, will cause it to be remembered as one of exceptional interest. The average attendance was between seventy and eighty. The discussions were spirited and interesting; it was evident, however, that some of the papers were less adapted for discussion than others. Late in the afternoon, the Convention adjourned to meet next year at the time and place to be determined by the Executive Council.

HERBERT EVELETH GREENE.

*Cathedral School of St. Paul, L. I.*

### THE LEGEND OF ST. MARGARET.\*

#### II. THE CAMBRIDGE TEXT.

- Puis ke Deus nostre sire de mort resucita,  
Veant ses angleles a son pere monta,  
Granz companies de seinz e de sentes y lessat,  
E puis pur luy morurent e yl les corrupat :  
5 Del son celestre regne large pars lur dunat.
- A icel tens diable aveient granz poetez,  
Pur seinte Yglise prendre esteient si pensenz,  
Quant il trovent nul hom qui seyt cristienez,  
Si esteit pendu ou ars ou lapideez,  
10 Ou destret de chivaus ou haut el vent croulez :  
Mes cil ke n'en chaleit tant en ert honurez  
Que en permanente gloire en est corunez.
- Seinurs des toz les autres vus lerai a conter,  
Fors de une sule virge me covent parler.  
15 Son seinur celestre tant pout toz jurs amer,  
Onkes pur nul turment que l'em le sout duner,  
Ne pur nule promesse ne wout de luy torner.  
Trayez ca vers moy : pri vus de l'escoter,  
Car vers son chier sennur vus pout ben aider.

\*Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES vol. iv, col. 397. The Cambridge Text appeared in the dissertation there referred to (Leipsic, May, 1889).

2 read *E veant* (P. MEYER) 13 for *des* read *de* 14 read *dunt me covent* (P. M.).

- 20 Ceste pucele fu mult de haut parentee;  
Si pere fu paiens de grant nobiltee,  
Theodorus out nun, onkes ne cremout De,  
Tuz ceus qui creeint en Deu out il en vilte,  
Nule rien ne hait envers cristiente.
- 25 Margarete la gente out nun, de la contre ert nez,  
Mult fu bele e curteysse, sage e honurez,  
De co secle hait la mauveise pounnee,  
En luy a mis son quor e tote sa pensee,  
A cel sennur s'est prise, jammes n'ert esgaree.
- 30 Dec ove les seinte virgens ert en cel honuree.  
Sennurs ore vus dirum de ceste Deu amie  
Sa vie e ses mors e cum ele fu nurie,  
E cum Olibrius l'occist e par grant emvie,  
E cum glorieusement ele finat sa vie,  
35 E cum ele parvint a la Deu companie.
- La bele Margarete pus ke ele fu nee  
En une cite fu nurrie e commandee  
Ke de Antioche fu unce liues mesuree,  
A une prude femme ki ele fu liveree.
- 40 Ele la norrist si ben cum si ele le ust portee,  
Unkes pur nul engin ne pouit estre blamee.  
Quant avint issi ke sa mere finist,  
En emfern alad si cum le livre dist,  
Maves hostel i trova sanz nul encontredist.
- 45 E la bone norrice Margarete norrist,  
Ele l'amoût assez plus l'amast e igist.  
Contre co k'ele l'amat e si pere le haist.  
Bien fu de sa nurice : onc de luy ne partist  
Des i ke Olibrius le provost la seist.
- 50 Tant nurist la meschine ke ele pout aler,  
E ke ele fu resonable e sage de parler.  
Les passius de martirs oit reconter,  
E les uns oit arder, les autres lapider,  
Echorcher tuz vis ou pendre ou decoler.
- 55 A idunc commenizat en Deu sey a fermer,  
Jammes ne departirat pur tote demembrer.
- Co fu a cel tens que ele aveit quinze ans,  
Les vellies gardout ove les autres enfanz,  
Del chemin la chosist un mauveys tirant.
- 60 Uu culvert a dist : ore vey une pucele,  
Onkes al men escient ne veistes plu bele :  
Alez demandez luy si ele fraunche ou ancele,  
En quel deu ele creyt e comment l'um l'apele.

22 The Latin MSS. read *Theodosius*, which is also the reading of most of the derived versions. 27 read *posnee* 33 strike out second e—"A propos d'OLIBRIUS il est à remarquer que c'est probablement du persécuteur de Sainte Marguerite, autant que du dernier et faible héritier de la pourpre romaine, qu'est venue la renommée proverbiale attachée à ce nom." (JOLY.) 38 *unce* : but the Latin MSS. have *quindécim* which is preserved generally in the derived versions. 40 for *le ust* read *la ust* 46 The MS. has *iglist*. Perhaps we should read *Ela l'amout assez plus ke cele Ki en gist* 47 strike out *e* and read *la haist* 58 read *ovellies* 62 and 66 for *ele* read *est*.



- Li mestre felon s'en sunt d'ilec tornee,  
 65 A luy vindrent ensemble com lur fu commandee,  
 Si ele franche ou ancele co luy hunt demandee,  
 E de quel creance ele est e de quel parentee.
- La gloriuse virgne lor respond bonement,  
 Car ele ert replenie de grant aseinement :  
 70 Crestiene sui franche : co respund vereiment.  
 En Deu le fiz Marie crei jo parfitement,  
 Qui regneyt sor toz jurs e ert parfitement.
- Mes cum parole plus plus sa beaute amerent :  
 Quant il sa creance oient munt s'en irent :  
 75 D'ilokes s'en sunt tornez, demorrance ne firent,  
 Al provost l'on conte, de nent ne luy mentirent.
- Arreement lur dist : fetes la moy venir.  
 Par toz se deus en iore il luy estoveit geyr,  
 Autrement le frad de male mort muryr.  
 80 Sanz demorrance cil l'alerent sesyr.
- Butint e decirent cil maves tirant,  
 E de diz e de fecz la wont contraliant.  
 Ne seit ke deit fere, anguisse ad grant ;  
 Vers le ciel regarde la bele a son amant ;  
 85 Dusement luy ad dist : mester ay de garant,  
 Beau pere maintenez moy des ore en awant.
- Byeu sire gardez moy pur tes intime nuns,  
 Pere ne perdez m'alme ho ces maves felluns.  
 Autresi suy entre eus com owaillye entre lus.  
 90 Ottrez a faire au provost teus respuns  
 K'il ne me puse veintre par torment perillius.
- A iceste paroles wint dewaunt le felon.  
 Il luy a demande son linghage e son nun,  
 E en quel deu ele creit die luy sanz tencun :  
 95 Cristiene suy franche : ce respond sanz tencun :  
 Si crey en Jhesu Crist e Margarete ay a nun.
- Creys tu dunc Margarete en icel creatur  
 K'en la croiz occist mi auncessur ?  
 Oil, fet Margarete, luy crei jo e aour.  
 100 Co lur torne onkore a mult grant deshonor,  
 En emfert le pulent sofrent grant dolor.
- Si irez fu luy provost quant il l'oiert parler,  
 En un oscure chartre la commanda enserer,  
 De ke ele eit torment dont la puisse dampner.  
 105 En Antioche veit pur ses deus aurer,  
 Pur cristiens querre : de cel ne wount cesser,  
 K'il il ne pusse a hunte occire e grevement tor-  
 menter.
- Quant il fu repeyre fist la venir a sey,  
 Dist luy : bele pucele aiez merci de tey,  
 110 Mes deus puantz aoure, e si crey en ma ley :  
 Grant avoyr te duray, co sachez par ma foy,

73 read *amirent* 74 for *munt* read *mult* 76 for *on* read *ont*  
 79 for *le* read *la*. 81 read *La butent* 87 for *tes intime* read  
*tum sentisme* 102 for *luy* read *li* 106 read *wout* 107 omit  
 second *il* and insert *les* after *ne*.

- E a femme te prendray, e bien seras de moy.  
 Margarete respund sanz autre demorrance :  
 Co seit Deus le men pere en ky ay esperance,  
 115 Ke a son os me garde co sachez sanz dotance,  
 Ke pur reyn que me diez ne perderay ma creance.
- Coluy voil je amer e aurer e duter  
 Ke tote choses garde, cel e terre e mer,  
 E secle de secles ne lerad sun regner.  
 120 Pur nule promesse que facez ne voyl de luy  
 torner,
- A luy voil je mun cors e m'alme commander,  
 Ke ove les seintes virgnes me face reposer.  
 Pur nus deinad son cors a mort li sire deliverer,  
 E je pur luy murir ne de mie duter.
- 125 Tote nue la fit dewant luy despulier,  
 En l'eyr la fit suspendre e de verges trencher,  
 E ele commence son seinnur a prier :  
 Sire aidez moy que je en ay mester,  
 En vus ay m'esperance, pere ne me lessez,  
 130 Enclin ka ta oreillie, me dolurs me leschez  
 Ke cil ne me charnissent qui vers moy sunt si  
 fer.
- Le richies commenca a preier la meschine ;  
 Beau pere envoy a me plays medicine.  
 En demeters ke la virgne sa priere define  
 135 La mavesse metnee del luy batre ne fine.  
 Le sanc vermel li curt aval par la peistrine  
 Cum ewe de funteyne qui curt par grant ravine.
- Olibrius co veit, si commenca a crier :  
 Bele purquey te les a hunte tormenter ?  
 140 Crei Margarete, ne te les dampner.  
 Le pople qui l'esgardent ne finent de plurer  
 Pur le sanc que veient de son cors avaler.  
 En plurant li unt pris dusement a mostrer :  
 Bele kar en pensez de te merci aver,  
 145 Iirez est li provost, ne te lerat durer.
- E vus conselier : Margarete dist lur :  
 Alez a vos osteus, n'ay soin de vostre plur :  
 Deus est mi aiders en ki je crei e aur.  
 E cum fere pucele tant eimet son seinnur,  
 150 De sey ne ad manee ne pite ne tendrur.  
 Vereiment est pleyne de spirital amur.
- Li macecren adcertes ne finent de ferir,  
 Li sanc vermeyl en funt de tote pars salir.  
 Li provost e li pople ne pount mes souffrir,  
 155 Lur oiz de lur meyns commencent a coverir.  
 Olibrius li dist ke l'eimed a hunir :  
 Si tu ne wous mes deus aurer e servir,  
 Tes os fray dejoinde e tes nerfs departyr.

Margarete respunt cum femme membre :

124 for *de* read *dei* 132 read *riches* 133 read *a mes plaies*  
*meine* 143 for *mostrer* read *monester* 152 for *macecren*  
 read *macecuer*.

- 160 Culvert fel e hardi, si ma char est pelfree  
M'alme ert en ciel hautement corunee.  
Dolenz est li provost, n'i out que corucer,  
Fet la en une chartre maintenant trebucher.  
Cele n'eubliad mie son seinnur a prier,  
165 E de la seynte croyz toit son cors a seinnier.  
Este vus o uns draguns de la chartre sallieit,  
Orible e ydus de leidde forme esteit;  
Chevus de plusurs guise, russe barbe aveit,  
Ses denz erent ferines sez ouz luisanz dreit,  
170 De buche e de narillies fu e flamme isseit,  
Un serpent de maleire sor le col li seeit,  
Un espee ardante en sa meyn teneit.  
En la chartre estuit, fortment prist a siflyr,  
N'i out tant oschur liu ou l'um ne veit ja cler.  
175 Tel pour oust la virgne quant issi l'ot demener,  
Quan vis pout onkes sor ses peiz ester.  
A oresuns se torne, oec ne wout oblier,  
Cum sule orfanine Deu prist a reclamer:  
Pri li ke li let au dragun devurer.  
180 En demeters que ele oure e li dragun la sesist,  
Si cum livere dist vive la transglutist.  
Ne pout sofrir la croiz dont ele sa garnist,  
Lui draguns en deu pars maintenant defendist:  
Seinne e save e halegree maintenant s'en issist.  
185 Del dragum ke ele oust vencu grant joie demenat,  
Aj es un autre diable a son fenestre estat,  
De mult leid figure, home neir ressemblat:  
Les menys e le cheffuz ensemble liez ad.  
Quant le veit la pucele mult grant pour en ad,  
190 Vers Dampnedeu se torne, sun nun glorifiat.  
Sa oreysun ad faite, Deus ottreez l'at.  
Dementers ke la virgne sun sengor priat,  
Li adversers s'aprimat, par la meyn seisi l'at.  
Ele fu de Deu soure, par le chevus li prist,  
195 Par Deu vertu le tret que a terre le mist,  
E puis sun destre pe sor le col li assist.  
Alez vus ent de moy: la seinte pucele li dist:  
O malingnes esperiz, tute destruit Jhesu Crist.  
A la beste pudlente de enfern m'est reclamez:  
200 Cesse de ma persone, tot te confunde Deus,

176 read *Que avisonkes pout desor ses peiz ester* 179 insert *ne after ke* 180 strike out *e* 182 for *sa* read *se* 183 read *Li draguns and se fendist* 186 *A son fenestre* This reading is probably occasioned by a too casual perusal of the Latin MS. In the Cambridge Version M. M. iv. 6. we read "aspiciebat in *sinistram* partem carceris, et ecce vidit ...." A few lines earlier we have "Nutrix aspiciebat per *fenestram*, et orationes eius scribebat" 188 *Cheffuz* should probably be *genus*. The Latin has "manus suas ad genua colligatas." The Scotch version has "with handis bundine til his kneis." An O. E. text of the twelfth century reads "his honda to his cneowun gebundenne" 198 for *tute destruit* read *te destruite* 199 for *m'est* read *s'est*.

- En moy ni avera tu rien cheteif malurez,  
Car je suy a Jhesu Crist epuse e espritez.  
E en demeters que la virgne ces paroles diseit,  
Este vus un clarte qui del ciel descendeit.  
205 Margarete en la chartre tote resplendisseit,  
E la croiz Jhesu Crist dedenz apparisseit,  
Un blanz colum sur li se seit,  
E luy dist: Margarete tu es bonuree,  
Seint angele atendent ta alme, del gloire ert  
corunee,  
210 De parais la porte ne te ert mie neie,  
Car ta virginite a Deu as ben garde.  
Ele rend a Deu graces cum femme senec,  
Puis s'est au diable del la chartre torne.  
Ele luy comandad sa nature conter:  
215 Il luy prie un poi son pe lever,  
Ke il puisse ove luy deliverement parler.  
Tote ses males ouvres luy permet a conter.  
A virgne son talon un poy sus levad,  
Ke il fut e comment out nun tretuit li contad,  
220 E en apres Boelzebub Bebzino sey numad:  
De males overes fere dist ke onkes ne cessad.  
Ore sez com ay nun, ore orez mun mester:  
Jo suy co ke les seinz homes mest fors de lur  
mester:  
Quant il doivent veiller jo les fat en mal veiller;  
225 Vers ceus qui te ressemblent ne puis espleter,  
Curceus e dolent m'estoit repeirer.  
Vencu m'as Margarete, vers tey ne pois durer:  
Mes armes sunt freines, vers tey ni les puse  
porter,  
Car jo vey en tey Jhesu Crist parfitement regner.  
230 Pur co quant ke tu wous fere te lest Deus  
esperser.  
Tis pere e ta mere mis en peyne ensemment,  
Ensemble ove mei viverunt en enfern le pulend.  
De tei ke lur filie es curuce si forment  
Que par tey sui vencu qui en Deus creis verei-  
ment.  
235 Margarete respund: de mei quei te enchandrast,  
E ke les seintes ovres agraverent te lessat.  
E luy estuveit dire co ke ele luy commandat,  
Sa vie e sa vertu tretuit luy demandat,  
Dunc est arme de fey, e Deus garde luy ad.  
240 Ki ele est e ses ovres puis luy demandad.  
Margarete respund que en Deu s'afie:  
Ne est dreit que digne chose te resent ne die,  
Grace Deu ke sui tel ne te celerai mie.  
Cil reddist encontre de sa grant felonie:

207 for *blanz* read *blans* 217 read *promet* 218 for *a* read *La* 224 for *fat* read *fac* 228 for *freines* read *freites* 230 read *esperer* 235 for *de* read *di* 242 for *resent* read *reconte* 244 for *encontre* read *encore*.

- 245 Satanas est nostre mestre, Dampneudeu le maudie,  
De parais chai par sa grant felonie;  
Ou ke il wout nus enveit, partuit veit epie,  
Quant il trove nus hom qui seit de seincte vie  
Luy agueite e manasce e de mort le defie.
- 250 Angles de seintors nus sout l'um apeller;  
Quant orad nostre mestre de ta bonte parler,  
E que Ruffin as mort, ne porra mes durer.  
Sachez que en awant ne puis a tey parler,  
Car jo sent bien en tey Seint Esperist converser.
- 255 Ancele Dampneudeu jo te pri e requer,  
Un poi de ma cervele tun pe moi alascher:  
De tut ne me destruye que travail en ai fer:  
En tel liu m'en envei u nen ai mester,  
Ou ne pousse mes ne nuire ne aider.
- 260 La bele Margarete poit consentir.  
La terre comandeit abair e tost overir:  
Le diable fait enz par grant veie saillir.  
Cist ne porra jammes a crestien nuir.  
Teu sengor dewum nus tuz aurer e servir,
- 265 Ke si seit ses fideus garder e mentennir.  
Ore est venu lu terme k'ele sera pene.  
Li fel Olibrius l'ad tot demande:  
Quant issi de la chartre a Deu s'est commande:  
A grant turbes la suvit la gent de la contree
- 270 Que voudrunt esgarder cum ele serad penee.  
Veant le provost vint, ne pout plus demorer.  
Que se veirs deu aurt prie lui a consentir.  
Cele lurt respunt que le pople l'oet cler:  
Chestif mult meuz te wausist celui aurer
- 275 Qui tut a fet ce mund e cel e terre e mer  
Qui te deus qui ne oent ne ne pount parler.  
Quant li provost l'entend n'i out ke corrucer.  
Dunc la fist despuillier e sus en l'eire lever,  
Deable pars lur commanda lampes alumer,
- 280 Que tuit le cors lui puissent arder e embruler.  
Cil ne se targerent a ki il fu commandee,  
E deame pars le costez ont le fu aioste:  
A hunte la demeneit par lur grant cruelte.  
Cele en dementers sa oreisun ad fet ad De:
- 285 Sire bruilliez mon cors par ta grant pite,  
Que en mei ne seit truve nul iniquite.  
Le provost lui ad dist: Margarete creras,  
E a mes deus puans sacrifieras.  
Dunc respund Margarete: a ce ne me meurras;
- 290 Quar ta deitez mult haz que tu tant cher as.  
Un grant vaissel de ewe donc il fet apoter,

247 insert *e* before *epie* 250 for *de seintors* read *deserites*  
261 for *abair* read *a baer* 266 for *lui* read *le* 267 for *tot* read  
*tost* 269 for *suvit* read *sivit*. The MS. has *seuvit* (cf. in  
the Brit. Mus. Cott. MS. of Josaphaz the form *seuissent*  
which Koch read *seuissent*). 273 for *lurt* read *lui* 279 read  
*D'ambes pars* 282 for *deame* read *d'ambes*.

- Liez e pez e meyns la fist einz trebucher.  
Par sa grant irreisun iloc la wout neer:  
Mes ele commenceit Deu forment a prier;  
295 En lui ad se esperance e tut sun recoverer.
- E Deus ke tuz jurs regnes en parmanabletez,  
Del pople qui ci est qui tun nun seit glorifiez:  
Sire moy par ta grant poestez,  
Sacez qui par pour ne le t'ai pas ruvez.
- 300 Mes pur co que ce pople veingne a crestienez.  
E facent sacrifise par bone volunteez.
- Un bland colum sor sa epaule li sist,  
E ce fu lui Seint Espirist ke lui trammit,  
Pur lui conforter que rien ne cremist,
- 305 E pur lui delier que seine s'en issit.
- Quant deliez fu graces a Deu en rend,  
Del wessel s'en issi veanz tuz erraument.  
Sire Deu dune me as vertu e ensement,  
Mult m'as ben garde, si t'en gracie fortment:
- 310 De mey as fet honor e glorifitment:  
Beneit seies tu qui es sanz finement.
- Une voiz luy ad dite: beneite seras,  
Car ta virginite a Deu ben garde as;  
Vien el regne du ciel, iloc reposeras,
- 315 De vie parmenable corrune seras.  
Cinc milier de la gent creit ingnele pas,  
Estre assez des autres que numer ne puis pas.
- Olibrius co veit, fortment s'en corrucat:  
Tretuiz de maintenant decoler fet les ad,
- 320 Apres ingnelement ses sergans apellad:  
Penez moy Margarete, jammes ne garrad,  
De la teste trencher mes respit ne averad.  
Cil le firent tost quant il le commandat.
- Fors de la cite la unt inelepas mene;  
325 Malcus out nun li serf a ki ele fu liveree;  
Le col li ruve estendre si ad traite l'espee,  
Sanz autre demorance ja la ust decole,  
Quant de la croiz celestre la vist avirune.

Grant pour oust li serf, merci prist a crier,

295 read *s'esperance* 298 insert *weintenes* after *sire* 300  
for *crestienes* read *crestientes* 302 for *bland* read *blans* 303  
omit the first *lui* and insert *le* before the second *lui* 319  
other versions localise the massacre more or less accurately.  
The Harleian MS. 280r has "in Decapoli et Armenia civi-  
tate." The Cambridge MS. (M.M. iv. 6) has "in campo  
Lim et Armenia." The Bodleian MS. 34 reads "in an burh  
of Armenie Caplimet inempnet," an evident corruption of  
the above mentioned reading. The Paris MS. 1555 has "ou  
champ c'on apele Lyment" and the York version "en un  
bel champ ki Limech est clamez," pointing to the same  
error. The O. E. text printed by COCKAYNE in his 'Narra-  
tiunculae' reads "in Limes feold." An interesting fiction,  
based on a false reading of this passage in a Seville Breviary,  
was referred to in the sketch of the history of the Legend.  
321 read *garirad*.



- 330 Cele luy respundi quant issi l'oet parler :  
 Tu neis e si m'essaies entor mei converser,  
 E tu me cries merci e me wous decoler;  
 Ne de omicide fere ne wous onkes cesser;  
 Mes tu me dune espace que je me puisse ourer,  
 335 E cil le octrad car ne le osat deneer.
- Quant Malcus de ourer la oust fet otteiment  
 Vers le ciel regarde, Deu preiad ducement;  
 Deu qui feis le ciel e la terre ensement,  
 Sire oez ma priere par tun commandement;  
 340 Ki la vie de moy lirra bonement,  
 E de ma passiun fra remembrement,  
 Ki a my eglise dorad enluminemet,  
 De tretuz lur pecchez fai alegement,
- Unkore te requier jo, cum le men seingor,  
 345 Ky my iglise frat e averterad en amor,  
 Ke ma passiun escriverat e averad en honur,  
 Sire rempliez lur de spirital amur,  
 De povrete l'engentez e par tut le sucour.
- E si acune femme ne pout emfanter,  
 350 E face mun martire dewant luy reconter,  
 E par bone creance me woudrat reclammer,  
 Bel Sire succur la, ne la lessez pener,  
 Ke si enfes ne seit muz ne awoglez.  
 Nule rien mes ki dreit n'i puse l'um truver.
- 355 Dementers ke la virgne cest oreisun dist,  
 Mult fort prist a toneir e grant horage fit.  
 Dunc n'i oust si hardi qui de parler se tenist,  
 Ne meimes Margarete, qui terre ne chaist.  
 Estevus un colum qui belement la prist,  
 360 Ducement le levat, e apres li dist:
- Tu es bonuree; oyantz tuz dist lui ad:  
 Nent en en parays deweez ne te serad;  
 Quant qui as demande Deu otteie le ad;  
 Ki meindrat en tristur par tei leesce averad;  
 366 La ou ta passiun e ton livre serad,  
 Fudre ne tempeste ne mal n'i avendrat,  
 Ne malignes espiriz converser ne porrad,
- Ele flechist ses genuz, Deus en ad merciez,  
 Puis al macecren de fe ferir enortez.  
 370 Nun frai, fet il, Deu ad ove tey parlez.  
 Ele dist: si tu ne fais ja n'averas part en Deus.  
 A ceste paroles sa espee a sus levez,  
 Le chief del bu lui ad meintenant trenchez.  
 Ore en prent Deu l'arme qui le cors est fineez.
- 375 Od le alme li angele vers le ciel wont chantant:  
 Nus hom set la joie k'il wont demenant.

331 read *Tu me neis e essaies* 334 omit the second *me* 347  
 for *lur* read *le* 348 read *en getes* 358 read *qui a terre*  
*chaist* 362 omit one *en* 369 read *Puis a le macecrier de ferir*  
*enortez* 374 *arme* This form in Wace, "Quant il ot ce dit,  
 jus chief Leis la virgne l'ar me rendi," gave rise to a curious  
 misunderstanding in later versions. JOLY quotes from the  
 Paris MS. 1555 "jouste lui chiet tantost l'espee"!

- Contre co lui diable wont irrez e plurant.  
 Teophilus cuilli de lui le remanant,  
 En un eserin de marbre le respunt meintenant:
- 380 Par celui sumes nus de la geste sawant,  
 Il escrist le livre sy se mist avant.
- Cil ke la oust decole a pez lui est chait;  
 Pur co que il ad fet que paresche ne lui seit,  
 Seint angele pristrunt la alme, el ciel la porterunt  
 dreit.
- 385 La meinnee de infern de autre part seoit.  
 Honeint forment e criernt, que le pople le oeit  
 Dient que lui lui Deus est grant en ki la virgne  
 creoit.
- Tut cil qui sunt priss de divers enfermetez,  
 Mult sunt awogles, desirus de sauntez,
- 390 De lui quant parler oient ilec sunt alez:  
 Dec'il tochent le cors sempres sunt munde;  
 Ne sentent puis nul mal ne nul enfermetez.
- Es kalendes de Aÿst del siecle trepassat,  
 Quant l'um en cest siecle de lui memorie frat.
- 395 Deu cum gloriusement sum martire finat,  
 Dreiz est que od Deu seit, car ben de servir l'ad,  
 Si est ele sanz dotance, jammes ne partirat.
- Ele deprie Deu qui est sanz mentir,  
 Ke il nus gard de tuz maus, e nus doit deservir,
- 400 Quant les ames de nus deivent del cors partir,  
 Quant a sa companie puissuns parvenir,  
 Qui vivit et regnat Deus per omnia secula  
 seculorum.
- Amen.

FREDERIC SPENCER.

University College of North Wales.

### THE "NASAL TWANG."

Pupils in the common school often present themselves with defects and peculiarities of utterance which ought to have been prevented in the nursery, but which, having been neglected there, should be—because they can be—rectified in the school. Even the worst impediments—stammering and stuttering—may be relieved and checked by kindly direction; and consonant malformations, as in lisping, burring, lallation, etc., may be corrected with

377 for *lui diable* read *li d.* 378 The Latin MSS. have *Theotimus* (Theotinus). WACE has *Theodimus*, the Scotch version *Theophine*, MS. Auchinl *Theodosius*, Bodl. MS. *Theochimus*. The Paris MS. 1555 follows the Latin. 381 for *livre sy se mist* read *l. e si le m.* 386 for *criernt* read *crieint* 387 for *lui lui Deus* read *li D.* 388 read *pri* 396 for *de servir* read *deservi* (P. MEYER) 401 for *Quant* read *Que* (P. M.).

but little difficulty, where the teacher possesses the necessary knowledge of the mechanism of speech. Such obvious minor faults as thrusting out the tongue, locking the teeth, deforming the lips, drawling, mumbling, gasping, sucking the breath, etc., will be easily removed when the pupil's attention is competently directed to them. But there are other peculiarities the cause and means of cure of which are less easily discerned. Prominent among these is the "nasal twang," which has, from ignorance and negligence, become a characteristic of the speech of certain districts. Some directions as to the mode of overcoming this great blemish will probably be welcomed by teachers.

The first point is, to make the pupil conscious of the difference between nasal and non-nasal sound. The mechanical cause of this difference is invisible; and the governing motion—of the soft palate—is so slight that the ear must be relied on, rather than organic sensation, to bring the process under control. To check the habit of unconscious nasality, begin by practising *conscious* nasality. Thus: pronounce the open vowel *ah* with an unmistakably nasal tone. Fix this effect in the ear, by repetition. Then pronounce the same vowel without nasal quality and fix this by repetition. Next, contrast the two sounds by frequent alternation, until the difference is clearly apprehended, first by the ear, and then, so far as possible, by organic sensation. The open vowel *ah* is selected for the first exercise, because it can be pronounced with the mouth widely opened. The assistance of the eye may thus, when necessary, be obtained to regulate the nasalising or denasalising action. For non-nasal sounds the top of the soft palate is raised, so as to cover the inner end of the nasal passage; and for nasalised sounds the top of the soft palate is depressed sufficiently to allow the breath to enter the nose. The whole action is exceedingly slight, and it is entirely concealed by the palate itself; but the eye can just discern the rise and fall of the upper edge of the palatal curtain. There is, besides, a feeling of tenseness in the soft palate, when raised, and of relaxation, when depressed.

The pupil, having learned to recognise by ear the presence or absence of nasality in the

vowel *ah*, should next pronounce other vowels, with contrasted nasal and non-nasal quality. Thus: nasalise and denasalise the following words:

ooze, old, all, err, isle, air, ale, eel  
look, up, off, ask, as, ell, ill.

The three consonants *m, n, ng* are purely nasal. The pupil should prove this for himself, by prolonging the sounds of these elements, and then endeavoring to do so while holding the nostrils with finger and thumb. The sound is instantly stopped.

The *junction* of non-nasal vowels with nasal consonants is the next and ultimate process. In pronouncing the word *may*, for example, the closing of the palatal valve to stop the nasal sound of *m* must be absolutely simultaneous with the opening of the lips to emit the vowel *ay*. The difficulty is, that the nasal valve, being open for *m*, does not promptly close before the vowel is uttered: in fact, the vowel is, under the circumstances, more easily pronounced nasally than orally. Here the grand principle of correction of all faults of articulation applies. Pronounce the consonant and the vowel *separately*. Do not attempt to combine them. What is called "combination," even in the elements of a syllable, is, in reality, merely rapid sequence. The pupil has now acquired the power of pronouncing a vowel without nasality. Let him therefore analyse the syllable *may* into *m-ay* and the old difficulty vanishes. In like manner, when a vowel *precedes* a nasal consonant, separate the elements. Thus, *a-m i-n, o-n*. A very little practise will give the requisite facility, and produce the effect of "combination," without assimilation.

The nasalising habit is, as a rule, associated only, or chiefly, with syllables containing a nasal consonant, but many persons never pronounce a purely oral vowel. The worst feature is, that the speaker is rarely conscious of the peculiarity. Therefore, the first point to be gained, is to get the *ear* to distinguish nasal from non-nasal quality. Teachers have the power, by the means above presented, to remove the nasal blemish from the speech of their pupils, and ultimately, through them, from that of the community.

ALEX. MELVILLE BELL.

Washington, D. C.

# CÆDMON AND THE RUTHWELL CROSS.

In the belief that those students of Old English who have not ready access to the original will welcome the presentation of BUGGE's views concerning the Ruthwell Cross, as they appeared last year in the third and concluding part of his 'Studien über die Entstehung der nordischen Götter- und Heldensagen,' I subjoin a translation into English from the German of BRENNER (pp. 494-6). I have only to add that I fully concur in his rejection of STEPHENS' interpretation, while reserving my opinion concerning his own surmises.

"STEPHENS assigns the Ruthwell Cross to about the year 680 A. D. This opinion he based on the inscription at the top, which he reads as 'CADMON made me' ('Run. Mon.' pp. 419, 920), and understands by them, 'CADMON composed the verses which are found on this cross.' The CADMON mentioned he regards as identical with the poet CÆDMON, whose story is related by BEDE; *fauæpo* he explains as 3d sing. pret. of the verb which occurs in West Saxon as *fēgean*. This explanation of *mæfauæpo*, as both SWEET and I have already pointed out ('Oldest English Texts' p. 125; 'Studien' pp. 42-44), is impossible, and contains a number of gross errors. In Old Northumbrian the accusative *me* is *mec*, not *mæ*. But even were the reading *me*, this, according to the language of other inscriptions, could only denote the cross, and would have no reference to the authorship of the verses. According to STEPHENS, the *u* in *fauæpo* represents *w*, but everywhere else on the cross *w* is represented by an entirely different rune. STEPHENS would interpret *fauæpo* as the 3d sing. pret. of *fēgan*, *fēgean*, but in the dialect of the Ruthwell Cross this could only appear as *fægdæ*. Not merely does the *a* contradict STEPHENS' explanation, but the *u*, the *æ*, the *þ*, and the *o* as well. *Fauæpo* can not be the 3d sing. pret. of any weak verb whatever, for the ending of the weak verb after a vowel is never *-po* in Old Northumbrian, but *-dæ*, and is so found on the Ruthwell Cross itself. STEPHENS has confused the O. E. *fēgan*, *fēgean* (German *fügen*) with the entirely different Old Norse verb *fá*, which never signifies 'compose,' 'versify.'

"Since, according to GEO. F. BLACK

(*Academy* for Oct. 1, 1887), *cadmon* is now illegible, and since *mæfauæpo* can not mean what STEPHENS asserts it to mean, the date of the Ruthwell Cross can not be determined by STEPHENS' reading and translation of the inscription on the top stone. Though I have not seen the stone itself, I do not hesitate to propose another explanation; but in any case, whether the latter is correct or not, STEPHENS' interpretation is impossible. *Mæ* signifies 'more'; *æpo* is the regular Old Northumbrian form of the verb '(I) destroy.' Upon this firm foundation the explanation must be constructed. On the western side of the top stone is a representation of John the Evangelist with the eagle, and around it is the inscription in Latin letters, "in princ[ipio erat] verbum," the first words of the Gospel of John. On the eastern side, according to STEPHENS, is sculptured the dove with the olive branch.

"We should be warranted in supposing that the inscription on the eastern, as well as on the western side, has reference to the corresponding sculpture, and, as on the western side, the writing must have been above the relief. I should surmise that the complete inscription on the eastern side of the top stone was originally [*icne*] *godmon mæfahæpo*. *ICNE* would then have stood above the carved figure, just as *erat*, which has been conjecturally supplied, did upon the opposite side. My emendation, *godmon*, differs but slightly in its Runic form from STEPHENS' reading, *cadmon*. Finally I conjecture that the *u* in *fauæpo* is a false reading for the runic letter which stands for *h* in the word *almehhtig* on the Ruthwell Cross, the tops of both letters being of the same shape.

[*ic ne*] *god mon*  
*mæ fah æpo*

is a regular couplet, which would signify: (I, God, no longer destroy man in anger (inimically).'

"This is accordingly a poetical paraphrase of God's word to Noah in Gen. 8. 21: 'I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake . . . neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done.' The inscription is therefore entirely suitable to the representation which it encloses, that of the dove with the olive branch.



"SWEET has affirmed ('Oldest English Texts,' p. 125) that the language of the inscription shows that it cannot well be later than the middle of the eighth century, and this position seems to me to be well taken (I would refer especially to the forms *rodi* and *ungket*). SOPHUS MÜLLER is inclined to fix the date of the Ruthwell Cross at about the year 1000 (*Aarbøger for nord. Oldkynd.* 1880, p. 338 ff.). I am not capable of forming an opinion concerning the archæological grounds on which he bases his judgment, but the language of the inscription seems to me decisive against so late a period. Apparently everything is in favor of assigning the same date to the Bewcastle Cross as to the Ruthwell Cross."

The opinion of SOPHUS MÜLLER is more fully reproduced on pp. 44-45 of BRENNER's translation: "But the Danish archæologist SOPHUS MÜLLER concludes, as he obligingly informs me, that the Ruthwell Cross must be posterior to the year 800, and in fact to the Carolingian Renaissance, on account of its decorative features. The free foliage and flower-work, and the dragons or monsters with fore-legs, wings and serpents' tails, induce him to believe that it could scarcely have been sculptured much before 1000 A. D."

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

#### MATERIAM SUPERABAT OPUS.

OVID, in his description of the Palace of the Sun, writes: "*Materiam superabat Opus.*" That is a good motto for Æsthetics. It means enough, and in expression is apt enough, for a handy rule. Take any work proffered as art and the test question is, Does the workmanship surpass the material? It is the workmanship, and not the material, that constitutes art. We flounder often in discriminating, in a dazzling mass of material, the workmanship. Splendid material can hide a multitude of the artist's faults.

'Paradise Lost' is a grand mass of fine material. We are so overwhelmed with the material as not to see clearly the workmanship. As a piece of work it lacks of being a piece of fine art. The noise is made about Satan's loss of heaven, and not about Man's

loss of Eden. The fall of Man is a mere incident to the fall of Satan; it occupies the place of an incident. Satan's fall is the gorgeous front of the edifice, while Man's fall is the hinder part. The theme of 'Paradise Lost' demands that the effect—the fall of Man—be made more prominent than the cause—the fall of Satan.

Suppose we compare MILTON's Satan with SHAKESPEARE's Iago. We are pleased with the *material* of Satan. There is not a lovable piece of material in Iago, yet we admire the *work*. Satan is a hero. Is Iago? Satan draws us by all that we cherish in the heroes of history. He is the chief of the many throned powers that led the embattled seraphim to war on the plains of heaven.

His "mighty stature" accords well with his position. Notice him as he moves towards the shore of the "oblivious pool" to arouse his faithful followers:

..... "his ponderous shield  
Ethereal temper, massy, large, and round  
Behind him cast. The broad circumference  
Hung on his shoulders like the moon, whose orb  
Through optic glass the Tuscan artist views  
At evening."

"His spear—to equal which the tallest pine,  
Hewn on Norwegian hills, to be the mast  
On some great admiral, were but a wand."

And when his faithful are gathered from the pool,

"He, above the rest  
In shape and gesture proudly eminent,  
Stood like a tower."

He looked upon

"Millions of spirits for his fault amerced  
Of heaven, and from eternal splendors flung  
For his revolt; yet faithful how they stood  
Their glory withered."

"He now prepared  
To speak; .....  
..... attention held them mute.  
Thrice he assayed, and thrice, in spite of scorn,  
Tears, such as angels weep, burst forth; at last  
Words interwove with sighs find out their way."

That was heroism, too. He had the heart of a hero. Satan had a cause worthy of a hero, namely, "to regain those blissful seats." He had the following of a hero, too:

"Princes, Potentates,  
Warriors, the flower of heaven, . .  
..... powers  
Matchless, but with the Almighty."

With all he had the unconquerable will of a hero.

In making Satan fight to regain heaven, MILTON spoilt him for a devil. He is not a whit more diabolical than SHAKESPEARE'S Coriolanus! How out of keeping it is to have Satan undertake the easier enterprise of seducing the new race called Man, "less in power and excellence!"

After a long debate in the synod of the gods, Satan, self-appointed, heroically takes his solitary flight through hell, fights heroically with Death, then wings his way, heroically, through Chaos and old Night, and finally, brings heroically (?) to grief a pair of pigmy innocents!

One glance at Iago will be enough. He had not been deprived of the lieutenantcy which he was seeking. In his own estimation he was worthy the position, but with Othello Cassio was the man. He had no motive for his conduct except of his own diabolical hatching; yet how skilfully he brought the direst results to that happy pair! He was a devil!

After all is said, 'Paradise Lost' is intensely interesting. But suppose the workmanship surpassed the material!

JOHN PHELPS FRUIT.

Bethel College, Ky.

#### THE NOMINATIVE ABSOLUTE IN ENGLISH.

Professor GILDERSLEEVE in his excellent 'Latin Grammar' (§ 409) says: "The Ablative Absolute may be translated by the English Objective Absolute, which is a close equivalent." Should the English equivalent of the ablative absolute be called the objective absolute? Here is an illustrative example, with its translations: "Xerxe regnante" (= Quum Xerxes regnaret), *Xerxes reigning. When Xerxes was reigning. In the reign of Xerxes.*

Is "Xerxes reigning" the English objective absolute, or "In the reign of Xerxes"? Not the latter, surely, for the preposition *in* does anything else but absolve the syntactical connection. In Latin, the ablative absolute absolves syntactical connection; in Greek, the genitive absolute; in English, the—what? the functional relations are never disturbed.

"When Xerxes was reigning" is syntacti-

cally connected with the main sentence, so also is "In the reign of Xerxes," but "Xerxes reigning" is not thus connected and therefore *absolute*. Is it objective absolute? It is nominative absolute.

To say that "Xerxes reigning" is objective absolute is to say that "Xerxes" is in the objective case. To say that "Xerxes" is objective is to admit a vital syntactical connection with the principal sentence, for "reigning" does not govern "Xerxes." When is a noun in the objective case? When it is object of an active transitive verb, or of a preposition. It is the syntactical connection, expressed or implied, that makes it the object. The mere omission of the governing word does not make it "absolute." Is it not a contradiction to say objective absolute?

A noun in the objective case is *governed*, but a noun in the nominative *governs*. The noun (*Haupt-wort*) in the nominative is pre-eminently, the 'head-word': the verb agrees with it and not it with the verb. The nominative, syntactically speaking, holds the reins, the effect of the verb and adjective on the noun is logical and not syntactical.

A noun in the objective case is ruled by something within the sentence, but a noun in the nominative—in principal or subordinate clause—is not so ruled. Take the clause "When Xerxes was reigning." Whence comes the demand for making it "Xerxes reigning"? From the higher rhetorical principle of condensation. Rhetoric asks "Xerxes" to let go "was reigning," which done, the syntactical connection made by the conjunctive adverb *when* is dissolved, and the nominative "Xerxes" absolved of its verb in a finite mode.

But is it nominative absolute? It is not objective, as has been argued. It is not possessive, nor dative. It must be nominative.

Is "Xerxes" in any case? Every noun performing a function in a sentence will have a case. In MEIKLEJOHN'S 'English Grammar' is this rule: "A Noun and an Adjective, or a Noun and a Participle, or a Noun and an Adjective Phrase,—not syntactically connected with any other word in the sentence,—are put in the Nominative Absolute."

JOHN PHELPS FRUIT.

Bethel College, Ky.

### THE OBJECTIVE ABSOLUTE IN ENGLISH.

There are two well-marked methods of dealing with the grammar of our present English. The practical teacher will strive to establish such practical categories as may best represent the doctrine of good usage. The historical student of the language, on the other hand, resolves these practical categories into their original parts, and finds the highest grammatical significance not in how we now say things, but in how we have come to say things as we do say them. It is perhaps good enough for practical purposes to teach that in such expressions as "the more the merrier," the function of *the* is adverbial, or that a certain group of verbs like *may*, *can*, *shall*, *will*, differ from other verbs in the language at the third person singular of the present indicative, but in both cases a knowledge of the earlier conditions of the language supplies the true explanation. And the true explanation, rather than a temporizing one, may be applicable and helpful at an earlier period in training than it is sometimes supposed to be. As to the examples cited, the teacher may decide at what age the pupil shall be told of the original case-form of *the*, but when the proper time for it has come the duty must not be neglected. When the history of *may*, *can*, etc., is to be inquired into, then will follow in natural order, and in illustration of important laws in language, an explanation of *need*, *ought* and *must* as indicative presents of the third person singular. These examples illustrate that class of facts belonging to historic grammar which, it will be agreed, should not be withheld from the upper classes in our secondary schools. Most of the lessons to be learned from historic grammar must, of course, be deferred to subsequent and more extended training. A sense for the merely curious, on the part of both teacher and pupil, must ever be properly controlled—it will else make pedagogic havoc of both. If we but knew at what period in the lad's education the wise Bishop ULFILAS would have taught his son (provided he had had a son, and had known the given fact) that *bisunjanð* was, historically, the genitive plural of a present participle, we might then have a basis to speculate upon the

time at which an English-speaking boy could with profit be told that *yore* is the genitive plural of *year*.

But I wish to offer a brief comment on the subject brought forward by Professor FRUIT in his article on "The Nominative Absolute." It is a subject which, as he has illustrated, may be reasoned upon in terms and notions derived from practical grammar. Such reasoning, however, has its pitfalls. It is not a simple matter to define the English objective case—that *locum tenens* of all oblique relations. When we say, The sky was clear the whole night, we use an objective case which is not accounted for in Professor FRUIT's answer to his own question, "When is a noun in the objective case?" Nor do grammatical forms in modern English conclusively indicate case: 'It is I' and 'It is me,' serve exactly the same linguistic function, so that if we should come to admit the latter into good usage, we should have to place *me*, in this use, among the nominatives, as we have already done with reflexives like *himself*, *herself*. If, therefore, Professor FRUIT had insisted that pronouns, which retain the signs of inflection, when used in absolute clauses are prevailingly in the form of the nominative, he would still not have gained an unanswerable argument. On the other hand, it is clear enough that too much value must not be attributed to such an instance as is furnished by MILTON:

Dagon hath presum'd,  
Me overthrown, to enter lists with God.  
"Samson," ll. 462-3.

Indeed modern English is particularly adapted to the enforcement of the generalization that function in grammar is superior to form.

To arrive at the true import of the absolute construction we may ask such questions as these: What is the thought-relation that is to be expressed? By means of what grammatical device does language in general secure that expression? It is enough for our present purpose to say that the absolute clause expresses an oblique relation—a relation that is chiefly temporal in significance, and that the use of oblique cases for this construction in Greek and Latin is an indication of the true nature of the construction in all related languages. It is this philosophic conception of



the subject that would not permit Professor GILDERSLEEVE to speak of an English nominative absolute. But Professor GILDERSLEEVE had also in mind the fact that English in its period of full inflections had a dative absolute, and in naming its historic survival he aimed at consistency with the terminology of modern English grammar, in which all datives are classed as objectives.

It may be supposed that the nominative forms of the pronouns used in absolute clauses are, after all, a sufficient contradiction to any abstract notion of the nature of the construction. To this it must be replied, that reduced inflections make the adherence to the general principles of grammar all the more necessary. In most instances no case-signs are present in English, but grammatical relations are indestructible; and when the sporadic case-signs of the pronouns, for example, are in seeming contradiction to the nature of the relation expressed, we must look for something special to the history of those pronominal forms, holding fast meanwhile to the grammatical relation.

Let us look at the history of the absolute construction in English. We begin with the dative absolute in Anglo-Saxon (in origin a translation of the Latin ablative absolute); as inflections break down we come upon the transition or "crude" type (*vid.* CALLAWAY, 'The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon.' Baltimore, 1889, p. 2), in which the pronoun remains dative in form while the participle has lost all signs of inflection. But all nouns, as well as the participle, came to lose the inflectional signs of the dative case; we then obtained the 'crude type,' in which both noun and participle, though absolute, were without any trace of inflection. The final act in this history was the admission of the nominative forms of the personal pronouns into this 'crude' absolute construction—a dative absolute in disguise. Now it is clear that these pronouns (and the relative infrequency of their use in absolute clauses is significant) could not change the character of the construction. The conclusion is therefore arrived at that the absolute construction in English, despite the use of the nominative forms of the personal pronouns (the same is true of Italian), is historically the objective absolute.

The digression would lead too far should I, at this point, discuss the re-enforcement of the absolute construction, during the Middle English period, under the influence of Old French and possibly of Italian. I wish however to say that I am not convinced by EINENKEL's distinction between accusative and nominative absolutes (*vid.* 'Streifzüge durch die mittellenglische Syntax,' pp. 71 f.). No such difference is present to the English consciousness (*Sprachgefühl*); all true absolutes with us fall into essentially the same psychological category, and the occasional use of the nominative pronominal forms is but an indication of an effort to realize the absolute clause as in some way co-ordinate with the main proposition.

The practical teacher will find it simple enough to teach his pupil that the absolute clause is a clause of circumstance (chiefly temporal in sense) and therefore oblique (not nominative) in its true grammatical character; as to designation, the choice lies between 'the objective absolute' and merely 'the absolute.'

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

#### LES POÈTES FRANÇAIS DE NOS JOURS.—LES PARNASSIENS.

Il faudrait peut-être remonter au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle pour trouver la première des causes qui ont conduit à la formation de l'école parnassienne. Après que MALHERBE eut "réduit la Muse aux règles du devoir," la rime était considérée par presque tous comme un obstacle à la poésie; les littérateurs de l'époque l'avaient en horreur, le grand CORNEILLE en appelait à son frère Thomas pour trouver la rime qui lui manquait, RACINE disait que grâce à elle "il faisait difficilement des vers faciles," et FÉNELON, plus radical que tous les autres, proposa dans sa "Lettre à l'Académie" de l'abolir complètement.

Quel fut le résultat de cet état de choses? C'est que les poètes considérant la rime comme un ennemi avec lequel il fallait lutter plutôt que comme un élément d'harmonie du vers, cherchèrent, sinon à s'en affranchir d'une façon absolue, certainement à la traiter le moins cérémonieusement du monde; si bien qu'à la fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle la rime se trouva reléguée au dernier plan fisante et que plusieurs des écrivains du com-

mencement de notre siècle s'obstinèrent à rimer aussi pauvrement que VOLTAIRE.

Il arriva aussi que le vague, l'indécis, le nébuleux en vinrent à tenir trop de place dans la poésie ; et, pour n'en citer qu'un exemple, peut-on rien imaginer d'aussi insaisissable que les strophes suivantes de LAMARTINE ?—

Si tu pouvais jamais égaler, ô ma lyre,  
Le doux frémissement des ailes du zéphire  
A travers les rameaux,

Ou l'onde qui murmure en caressant ces rives,  
Ou le roucoulement des colombes plaintives  
Jouant au bord des eaux ;

Si, comme ce roseau qu'un souffle heureux anime,  
Tes cordes exhalaient ce langage sublime," etc., etc.

Il faut reconnaître, avec tout le respect qu'on doit au chantre de Milly, que "ces ailes du Zéphire," "ce roseau qu'un souffle heureux anime," ne donnent à l'esprit qu'une idée difficilement concevable.

Les Parnassiens entreprirent deux choses : rendre à la rime la place à laquelle elle a droit, et dégager la poésie de cette nébulosité que nous venons de signaler. Ils pensèrent que la langue poétique n'est pas nécessairement vague et indécise, et que les choses les plus exactes et les plus précises peuvent être mises en vers tout aussi bien que "l'azur du ciel" ou "les ondes argentées des lacs." Nous verrons plus loin comment M. SULLY-PRUDHOMME a compris et pratiqué cette théorie. Outre cela on peut dire qu'en France la beauté de la forme a toujours été en littérature la qualité *sine qua non* du succès ; plus ou moins le Français a toujours eu le culte de "l'art pour l'art," et notre époque, loin d'avoir abandonné cette théorie, l'a plus que jamais remise en vigueur.

D'où faut-il dater l'origine de l'école parnassienne ? De 1857, pensons-nous, année qui vit paraître "Les Fleurs du mal" de BAUDELAIRE et les premiers recueils importants de LECONTE DE LISLE et de THÉODORE DE BANVILLE.

Ce dernier nous a donné dans son "Petit traité de poésie française" une justification complète de la rime : "Tant, dit-il, que le poète exprime véritablement sa pensée, il rime bien ; dès que sa pensée s'embarrasse, sa rime aussi s'embarrasse, devient faible, traînante et vulgaire." Un de nos critiques a

défini M. DE BANVILLE "un poète hypnotisé par la rime," et lui-même nous dit quelque part :

Je ne m'entends qu'à la métrique,  
Fils du Dieu qui lance des traits,  
Je suis un poète lyrique.

Donc, pour lui, tout *pour* et *par* la rime. Le pauvre MURGER qui faisait rimer *pieds* et *ensommeillés*, disait spirituellement : "Mes rimes ne sont pas millionnaires, mais que voulez-vous ? je n'ai pas le temps de les enrichir," et il est probable qu'il eût fait piètre figure parmi les excellents versificateurs de notre temps.

Ecoutez maintenant cette charmante description du Matin de M. DE BANVILLE et admirez-en la beauté et la richesse :—

Viens. Sur tes cheveux noirs jette un chapeau de paille  
Avant l'heure du bruit, l'heure où chacun travaille,  
Allons voir le matin se lever sur les monts  
Et cueillir par les prés les fleurs que nous aimons.

Sur les bords de la source aux moires assoupies  
Les nénuphars dorés penchent des fleurs pâlies ;  
Il reste dans les champs et dans les grands vergers  
Comme un écho lointain des chansons des bergers.

Et autre part cette description de l'automne :

Nous n'irons plus aux bois, les lauriers sont coupés,  
Les Amours des bassins, les Nafades en groupe  
Voient reluire au soleil en cristaux découpés  
Les flots silencieux qui coulaient de leur coupe.  
Les lauriers sont coupés, et le cerf aux abois  
Tressaille au son du cor ; nous n'irons plus au bois.  
Où des enfants joueurs riaient la folle troupe  
Parmi les lis d'argent aux pleurs du ciel trempés,  
Voici l'herbe qu'on fauche et les lauriers qu'on coupe.  
Nous n'irons plus au bois, les lauriers sont coupés.

N'est-ce pas que la rime est riche et harmonieuse ? non seulement les règles de la versification sont scrupuleusement observées mais dans presque tous les cas la consonne d'appui (remarquez assoupies et pâlies, vergers et bergers, etc.) donne au vers une sonorité remarquable.

Voyons maintenant ce qu'est M. SULLY-PRUDHOMME. Sa muse est tour à tour philosophique, savante, éthérée, soit qu'il nous décrive les conceptions diverses de Dieu selon que l'ont conçu les différents philosophes et qu'il finisse en disant :

Dieu n'est pas rien, mais Dieu n'est personne : il est tout,  
soit que comme dans le "Zénith," cet hymne magnifique à la science, il nous dise :

Nous savons que le mur de la prison recule ;  
Que le pied peut franchir les colonnes d'Hercule,  
Mais qu'en les franchissant il y revient bientôt ;  
Que la mer s'arrondit sous la course des voiles ;  
Qu'en l'univers tout tombe, et qu'ainsi rien n'est haut.

Nous savons que la terre est sans piliers ni dôme,  
Que l'infini l'égale au plus chétif atome ;  
Que l'espace est un vide ouvert de tous côtés,  
Abîme où l'on surgit sans voir par où l'on entre,  
Dont nous fuit la limite et dont nous suit le centre,  
Habitacle de tout, sans laideurs ni beautés. . . .

toujours il réussit à nous intéresser et à nous faire admirer sa manière. Dirai-je que je le préfère dans le genre gracieux, dont les lignes suivantes sont un exemple ?—

Pendant que nous faisons la guerre  
Le soleil a fait le printemps ;  
Des fleurs s'élèvent où naguère  
S'entre-tuaient les combattants.

Malgré les morts qu'elles recouvrent,  
Malgré cet effroyable engrais,  
Voici leurs calices qui s'ouvrent  
Comme l'an dernier, purs et frais.

Comment a bleui la pervenche,  
Comment le lis renait-il blanc,  
Et la marguerite encor blanche,  
Quand la terre a bu tant de sang ?

Quand la sève qui les colore  
N'est faite que de sang humain  
Comment peuvent-elles éclore  
Sans une tache de carmin ?

Quelle a été l'influence de l'école parnassienne sur la poésie française ?—Cette école a été louée et critiquée d'une manière excessive, et, à notre opinion, elle ne méritait "ni cet excès d'honneur ni cette indignité," car elle ne fera pas époque dans la littérature contemporaine comme l'école romantique ou l'école naturaliste.

Certainement elle eut ses fautes mais elle eut aussi ses qualités, et V. HUGO lui-même en avait reconnu le mérite et adopté les règles, comme cela peut se voir dans ses dernières productions poétiques.

Le reproche le plus important qu'on puisse adresser aux Parnassiens c'est d'avoir quelquefois sacrifié l'idée à la perfection de la forme. M. LECONTE DE LISLE et beaucoup de ses disciples ont abandonné la césure après le sixième pied pour la remplacer par une après le quatrième et une après le huitième. Hâtons-nous de dire que la chose n'a pas été généralisée et que, l'eût-elle été, il faut recon-

naître que cette coupe du vers ne manque ni de charme ni d'élégance. Disons, en terminant, que quelle que soit l'opinion qu'on entretienne, on ne peut refuser aux membres du Parnasse contemporain une connaissance parfaite de la langue et un talent poétique incontestable. S'ils avaient su observer davantage le *ne quid nimis* des Anciens, il est certain que leur place dans l'histoire littéraire de notre temps eût été brillante et enviable à tous égards.

C. FONTAINE.

Washington, D. C.

*Elene; Judith; Athelstan, or the Fight at Brunanburh; Byrhtnoth, or the Fight at Maldon: Anglo-Saxon Poems.* Translated by JAMES M. GARNETT, M.A., LL.D. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1889. 8vo, pp. xvi, 70.

Pioneers deserve our gratitude, no matter what our views may be in regard to the track which they follow; and when we remember what services Professor GARNETT has rendered to Germanic philology in general, and to Anglo-Saxon interests in particular, we feel more inclined to thank him for the result than to criticise him for details. He has given us the first earnest attempt in English to translate 'Béowulf.' At a time when Germans like HEYNE, in practice, and WÜLKER, in theory, had condemned that translation of Anglo-Saxon poetry which holds fast to the old form and diction (ETTMÜLLER, GREIN), Professor GARNETT came out with an English version which laid main stress upon the virtue of a "literal" rendering. For this general adherence to the form of the original, the present reviewer has praised the work of Professor GARNETT, and wishes still to praise it; but as regards the object and the nature of such "literal" translation, and the details of the work, gratitude must yield to criticism.

Of GARNETT's 'Béowulf' criticism has had its say. One thing about it no one has denied, and that is its sound scholarship. This absolute requisite for the task of a translator is brought in equal measure to the second undertaking of the sort, the work which lies before me. Before, however, attempting any



judgment upon the success of the translation itself, one must reckon with its purpose and its method. The purpose, as one easily gathers from GARNETT's various remarks (in the *American Journal of Philology* ii, 355-361; in his 'Béowulf' preface; and in the present work, p. vii), is to be literal; but literal for whom? For the "general reader," as we find in the preface to 'Béowulf'? Or, as we are told in the new book, is the "literal" quality meant to be "serviceable to the student"? But we surely do not put "line-for-line translations" in the hands of the student! Is it, then, for the student of English in general, who does not and will not study the original—the average "reader"? Take an old-fashioned interlinear translation of VERGIL or any other classic author; erase the original text: here is line-for-line, word-for-word translation, a wonderfully exact reproduction of the syntax and other peculiarities of the original: who would put this into the hands of a "general reader"? Such a reader has no interest in Anglo-Saxon syntax; but he has a great interest in Anglo-Saxon diction, style and metre. He wants the poem: if you cannot give him the poem, tell him the story of it in straightforward prose. We do know one prose-version of certain poems which, despite the absence of metre, is filled with poetry:—I mean the 'Edda' of the GRIMMS. Take this opening sentence of the first Lay of Helgi: \* "In uralten Zeiten, als Vögel weis-sagend sangen und heilige Wasser von him-melhohen Bergen herab rauschten da gebar Burghild Helge, den grossherzigen in Bra-wald."—That is translation! Between that, and the attempt to reproduce diction and metre in a poetical, thorough and dignified way, I see no *via media*.

Briefly, then, I think Professor GARNETT's great mistake lies in his choice of this same literal, line-for-line method, as he has understood the phrase. Literal and line-for-line by all means,—if it does not destroy modern English, if it does not rob the reader of that sense of poetry which was present, we may be sure, with the original hearer of the poem. I think I have shown that the literal method,

\* 'Edda,' GRIMM-HOFFMANN (Berlin, 1885) p. 22; cf. VIG-FUSSON-POWELL, 'Corp.' I. 131, for English prose.

as Professor GARNETT understands it, works for nobody's good; I shall try to point out its definite harm.

First we have jarring and un-English phrases, which result from the literal rendering of words. In 'Béowulf,' l. 202 runs (ed. HOLDER): *pone sið-fæt him snotere ceorlas lýt-hwón lōgon*; GARNETT translates (I use the second edition):

That journey to him *the cunning churls*  
Not at all blamed.

*Snotere* is not "cunning"; and *ceorlas*= "churls" is literal in a very dangerous sense. It does not make for antiquity, but for anarchy. Nor does it make for poetry, in reading the verses of 'Judith'—*hið þá on reste gebróhton snúde þá snoteran idese*, which Professor COOK and his scholars translate "to the couch they brought with speed *the seeress*"—to find this version in GARNETT: "they then to him at rest brought quickly *the cunning woman*." That is literal; COOK's "seeress" is, in one sense, not literal; but when we have thought of VELEDA and the rest, or of the fine eloquence with which TACITUS sets forth that "sanctum aliquid et providum" which the Germans revered in their women, then we can see what an Anglo-Saxon poet, singing of Judith, would mean by *snotor*: and we feel that the rendering "seeress," though perhaps a trifle strained, is much closer to the original than that degrading word "cunning"—as of Falstaff's "wise woman." This rendering is repeatedly given in GARNETT's book: cf. 'Judith,' 55, 125, 145. A greater favorite than "cunning," however, is the adjective "clever." 'Judith' (171) is "the clever with gold adorned"; and (334) the battle is won "by means of Judith's clever lore, the moody maid's." "Clever," "lore," "moody"—for *glæwe*, *lære*, *módigre*! I admit that COOK's rendering "mettlesome maid" gives us to pause;—but "moody"! To be sure, a note says "spirited": but why put "moody" in the text?—Must we translate *lǽwne*=idiot?—"Clever" for *glæw* is very common, especially in the 'Elene.' "Law-clever earls" for *eorlas & glæwe* (34) (and why "earls"?); "answers clever" (594); *glæwe miht*, which GREIN renders "der Weisheit Macht," is translated (1163) "clever might" ("him who

wisdom through clever might thoroughly knew");\* and the like. Some time ago RICHARDSON said of "clever" that "the word is not applied to the higher order of ability"; and the new dictionary tells a similar tale.—Is this trifling criticism? I think not. To meet words like "churls" or "clever," where the original has the equivalent of "men" or "wise," is just what degrades our idea of the poem. There is, moreover, a certain tact in choosing words, even where one is not literal; I am not sure that "thinking profoundly" gives us the right notion of *deophycggende* (352). But I am sure that *snyttrocraeft* had a nobler note than "craft of wit" (374); and that the sentence *pæt wæs prælic gepóht* is not adequately rendered by the literal "that was terrible thought" (426). In the same way, "life-weary" (the persons referred to were by no means eager to die) translates *fyrhðwérige*; ZUPITZA renders it "traurig im Herzen"; GREIN ('Dichtungen') "die Sinnbetrübtten."—Again, the literal may be obscure. Who, without the original before him, could know what "welling" (765) means in the lines about hell: "there now in the welling endure they death-pain"? In *wylme* means 'in the rolling or eddying flames';—one thinks of our *burn* or German *born* and *brennen*, but it is not fair to insist to such an extent on the general reader's knowledge of etymology. However, the obscure challenges our attention and sets us to work; it is in this respect better than the ignoble or trivial, which we take for granted. When ELENE makes JUDAS a bishop, she gives him a new name—and she does this *purh snyttrogepeaht* (1060), which GARNETT renders "through counsel of wit."—We do not call raven or eagle a "fowl" nowadays: in 'Judith' 207 there is not even the excuse of alliteration for it.

Of mistakes in translation but few have been noticed. In 'Elene' 618, JUDAS asks ELENE, if a man have the choice between bread and a stone, how may he reject the bread and take the stone, *þonne hé béga beneah?* GARNETT: "if both he enjoys." ZUPITZA (I have, unfortunately, only the first ed.) translates "zur verfügung haben." Now

\*GRIMM, 'Andreas und Elene' p. 151: "was sie wusten, beschlossen hatten. *Craft* ist *Scientia*."

GREIN, to be sure, gives ('Spr.' i, 90) "fruor" as first meaning; but in the 'Dichtungen' "wenn er beides bedarf." "Enjoys" is clearly wrong.—In 'Maldon' 34, why not adopt SKEAT's suggestion (in SWEET's note), and read "if ye are rich enough," for *gif ge spēdað tó þám?* GARNETT reads: "We need not each spill (destroy) if ye speed to this."—That "tonic" and ringing answer of BYRHTNOTH, *pæt hér stynt unforcuð eorl mid his werode* (51) is rendered: "Here stands not unknown an earl with his band." Surely *unforcuð* is a finer litotes—"not dishonoured," "not ignoble"; SWEET: "noble, excellent"; ZERNIAL ('Das Lied von Byrhtnoth's Fall,' Berlin, 1882): "unverächtlich."—But these are trifles. The chief fault to be found with our author's actual translation is the tendency to the trivial and commonplace, or else the ridiculous. Ridiculous is perhaps too strong a term; but compare this passage (805f.):

*hé mid bæm handum  
eadiġ and æġlæw upweard plegade.*

"With both his hands,  
happy and law-clever, upward he clapped."

So much for choice of words: now for their order. The line-for-line and literal method involves not simply the parallelisms, which are of course necessary, but also those arrangements of phrase and sentence permitted in a language which was still full of inflections. The result, unquestionably damaging to poetical effect, serves no good purpose otherwise; moreover—and this is enough to condemn it—the principle is not followed throughout with any consistency. Take for example 'Elene' 181, "The Son men saved from the bonds of devils," and 'Elene' 284, "were able to tell": A.-S. *ðlȳsde lēoda bearn of locan dēofla* (I should have read this, by the way, quite differently, taking subject from l. 179, and translating: "set free the children of men etc."), and *reccan cūdon*. Why write "the Son men saved"—rough, obscure—and yet "were able to tell," where an inversion would simply be awkward and useless, but not obscure? *Cui bono* to say: "Who the king that was hanged honor and praise" ('Elene' 453)? Whom does it help in any way when it reads: "Yet later the Lord mercy him showed, that to many became

he of people for comfort" ('Elene' 500)? Cf. further 'Elene' 526, where modern syntax is badly strained. If ('Elene' 578) we read "that you on the mountain bale-fire shall take," the context may help us; but what is gained by the obscurity? In short, the question arises: What good can come to any reader or student from these vexed and useless constructions? They are not English. They are not Anglo-Saxon. —One more example of this sort. 'Elene' 1168 f.: "That is becoming that word of the Lord thou hold in heart." . . . We say, of course, "It is becoming." The first "that" is a most useful word for teaching the evolution of the modern "conjunction" (Cf. KOCH, 'Satzlehre,' §514); but does this justify the use of it in modern English?

As regards the metrical rendering, I find the 'Athelstan' a spirited and successful piece of work, the best in the book.\* I can see no gain in the use of an erratic and occasional accent to mark the stress, as in 'Elene' 458, 884, and especially (1098) the almost ludicrous "Cyriacus on Calvary"; just before (1059), he was Cyriacus. Yet there are a great many admirable lines—full of the right movement and manner—which remind us of the original; they justify the assertion that if Professor GARNETT would only sacrifice the "literal and line-for-line" method as he understands it, and would resolve to translate the poem, he could silence all criticism. I take a passage, 'Elene' 86 ff., in proof:

"At hest of the holy, his heart-lock unloosed,  
Upwards he looked as the messenger bade him,  
Trusty peace-weaver. He saw bright with gems  
Fair rood of glory o'er roof of the clouds. . ."

Probably (as I said with regard to MORRIS's 'Love is Enough,' *American Journal of Philology* vii, p. 75) the anapaestic movement is too rapid for A.-S. verse; but the effect here is good.—GARNETT's 'Maldon' has successful passages; and, generally speaking, the work in this new book is better than the work in 'Beowulf.'

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

Haverford College.

\*In the Bibliography, GARNETT, like WÜLKER before him, omits from the list of translations of 'Athelstan' the version made by Mr. E. A. FREEMAN for his 'Old English History,' and printed on pp. 155 ff.

*The Articulations of Speech Sounds* represented by means of Analphabetic Symbols by OTTO JESPERSEN. Marburg: Elwert. 1889. 8vo, pp. 94.

Students of phonetics have reason to deplore the fact that in their rapidly developing science there exists no unity either in terminology or in mode of transcription. Each successive treatise on phonetics offers a new system of notation and has its own nomenclature. To take an example at random from an alphabetic list of phonetic terms printed in the appendix to the treatise before us, it appears that the terms *Flaps*, *Laterals*, *Linguolaterals*, *Liquids* and *Mittellauter* are all used by different phoneticians in describing the same class of sounds. The result is so bewildering that it often becomes a matter of no little difficulty to understand an author's meaning, if one happens to be unacquainted with the particular system which he uses. The present attempt is especially intended to remedy the confusion arising from these defects. It was our author's object to formulate a transcription which would do away with useless and misleading terminology, and which would clearly convey one meaning and one only.

The inefficiency of Roman letters for phonetic transcription, because of the many cross-associations to which they give rise, is well recognized. For reasons quite as apparent, the new signs must be based upon a physiological rather than an acoustic study of the sounds. Symbols resting on such a basis have been provided by Mr. BELL in his 'Visible Speech,' but their general employment is difficult for the practical reason that, while they can easily be written, only very few printing establishments are supplied with the types for them. Another important point to be considered is the fact that "all sounds are equally compounds." To take a simple example (p. 6): "The simple sound *m* is physiologically the resulting consequence of the following conditions: *α*, lips shut; *β*, tongue-point resting in the bottom of the mouth; *γ*, the surface of the tongue not raised towards the palate; *δ*, nose-passage open; *ε*, vibration of the vocal chords, and *ζ*, air expelled from the lungs." Altering any one of these positions, will



change the sound. A correct notation must be able to indicate all these particulars with perfect accuracy. But these considerations preclude at once the idea that any *one* symbol could be used to represent each sound; "*we must symbolize not sounds, but elements of sounds*" (p. 7). At the same time the symbols used must be such as can easily be printed and they must be perspicuous.

The author's purpose, as here outlined, has been admirably accomplished. By an ingenious combination of Greek and Latin characters, Arabic numerals, and other signs which are found in every well-equipped printing office, he has succeeded in giving us a system of sound-notation quite as accurate as are the symbols of chemistry. The system provides in the minutest manner for a symbolization of all the essential processes involved in the formation of speech-sounds. Indeed, the scheme is so elaborate that it is impossible to give a sketch of it within the limits of a review. The general outline is given (on p. 12) as follows: "Everything that takes place in the several active organs of speech is written on separate *lines* above each other. These lines are numbered by the help of the Greek alphabet,  $\alpha$  meaning the lips,  $\beta$  the tip of the tongue, and so on, proceeding inwards. On the lines are written *numerals* (Arabic and Roman) to indicate the size and shape of the configurative aperture; and to these numerals are added, by way of exponents, Roman letters, denoting the place of greatest narrowness. Here, as in the case of the Greek letters, we number the various positions *a, b, c*, etc., from the lips inwardly to the throat. The various positions of these exponents indicate smaller divisions in the acting organs, for which it has not been found necessary to create separate lines." This summary statement conveys but a very imperfect idea of the excellence of the system. Let me quote a single example, to show its practical applicability. The combination *un* is symbolized (p. 35) in the following manner:—

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c} \alpha & 3^a & \text{''} \\ \beta & g & \text{''} \\ \gamma & 3_j & \text{''} \\ \delta & 0 & 2 \\ \epsilon & 1 & \text{''} \\ \zeta & 4 & \end{array}$$

which, in order to save space, might also be written,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{cccccc} \alpha & 3^a & \beta & g & \gamma & 3_j & \delta & 0 & \epsilon & 1 \\ & & & & & & & 2 & & \zeta_4 \end{array} \right\}$$

It will be seen that the success of such a scheme is imperilled by its very elaborateness. It is not easily acquired, and necessitates a closer analysis of sounds than is customary. To apply the system to the transcription of texts of any length is quite out of the question, nor is such the purpose of the author. "What it claims is merely to provide the means of writing down phonetic minutiae in a comparatively easy and unambiguous manner; it will consequently be specially useful as a means of supplying a key for systems of transcription with our common letters adapted to particular sound systems, and of avoiding the defects of the usual phonetic terminology in discussions about the formation and history of speech-sounds. What it gives is not so much a set of readable symbols as half mathematical formulas of the different organs, and thereby enabling the phonetician to calculate what sound is meant." I have myself applied the transcription to some of the changes involved in the history of French sounds, and have been agreeably rewarded by finding what had before been obscure standing out in a much clearer light, when viewed under this new aspect.

This alphabetic mode of transcription is heartily to be recommended to all students of phonetics. The attempt is certainly in the right direction. To close with the author's own words (p. 39): "Let those who may find fault with them (a list of sounds, pp. 39 et seq.) . . . analyze and describe them more correctly by the help either of my notation or of some other that allows the same or a greater degree of exactness."

JOHN E. MATZKE.

Bowdoin College.

*The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon.* A Dissertation presented to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR., Ph.D. Baltimore, 1889. 8vo, pp. 52.

In the January number of MOD. LANG. NOTES I said of LOGEMAN'S 'The Rule of S.

Benet': "It may be mentioned in passing that this work is . . . a reproach to those (i. e. the universities) of our own country, which have never yet, to my knowledge, produced a doctoral dissertation of equal value on an Old English subject—at least none that, by attaining the dignity of print, has afforded equal instruction or stimulus to other investigators." At that time I could not foresee how soon I should be compelled to sign at least a partial retraction. The monograph before me is the one for which I had been vainly looking, or in any case so nearly fulfils the demands which I, in common with many other patriotic students, had been hopefully cherishing, that we are not likely to quarrel over a slight deficit or overplus. It is pleasant to think, nay it is significant too, that DR. CALLAWAY comes honestly by his learning and his love for English, being at once a Southerner and the son of a Professor of English. None of us ought to forget that it is to THOMAS JEFFERSON that we owe the first positive impulse toward Old English studies in America, nor that the South has, since JEFFERSON'S time and before, displayed a love for the English classics and a concern for intelligent English teaching which have not always and everywhere been common at the North. When I was at the Johns Hopkins University, some of the most zealous and appreciative of my advanced students were from Kentucky and the Carolinas, and one of them, MR. W. D. MCCLINTOCK, of Kentucky, has since become much more widely known, having for several years had charge of the English instruction at the Chautauqua Summer School of Languages, a responsibility which he has discharged to the increasing satisfaction of his students and his colleagues.—But to return to our monograph, the purpose of which is thus announced in the preface:

"An attempt is here made to give a history of the Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon. The frequency of this construction, its uses, its origin, and its stylistic value at once present themselves as questions pertinent to our inquiry and are accordingly discussed at length and as far as possible definitely answered. As contributing to a correct understanding of the Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon, a few pages are devoted to the same construction in the other Teutonic languages;

which, it need hardly be added, rest entirely upon the investigations of others.

The treatment of the subject proper is based upon a careful reading of the most important Anglo-Saxon texts accessible to the writer. By a reference to page 3 it will be seen what these are and that they include all the poetical monuments and practically all the purely literary prose monuments as yet published. In addition to this, the originals of all translations have been read, so far as they are definitely known; statistics have been taken of all absolute participles occurring in the same, and these have been compared with the corresponding translations in Anglo-Saxon."

The promise of the preface is faithfully fulfilled, and the student who bases his expectations on this announcement will not be disappointed when he sets about the mastery of the pamphlet. With this statement we might conclude, were not the combination of qualities here manifested so rare as to deserve special comment. In the first place, then, the paper may be called statistical, since it bristles with figures and citations. This is always a good sign, in so far as it gives evidence of patience and industry on the part of the investigator, and a disposition to submit any preconceived notions of his own to the arbitrament of facts. It is a bad sign whenever it reveals an incapacity to deal intelligently with the facts thus collected. In other words, there are good index-makers that have no aptitude for scholarship, in any large and liberal meaning of this much-abused but noble word. They are often useful purveyors of the raw materials of scholarship to others, without possessing a single qualification which would enable them to convert these materials into a finished product. Such is not the case with the author of this paper, whose capacity for a comprehensive treatment of his subject appears in his willingness to read the whole Old English literature, prose and poetical, with the care necessary for the collection of his examples; in that acquaintance with another language which enables him to check translations by their originals; in his familiarity with the inductive processes upon which modern science insists; in the healthy common-sense which leads him to obvious and natural classifications, rather than to supersubtle displays of his own ingenuity; in his utilization of the comparative method, as shown in his

inclusion of the other Germanic languages within the scope of his survey; and in his endeavor after philosophical treatment of the phenomena involved, considered with reference to their stylistic effect and psychological bearing, in its appropriate place near the end of his monograph. The catalogue of his qualifications is also a synopsis of his work, or at least may serve as a commentary on the author's own statement in the preface. It should be added that he has summarized his results at the very end of his paper, and thus provided for the student who may lack leisure or inclination to follow him through the details of his subject. Dr. CALLAWAY, who is now Professor of English in the Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, acknowledges special obligations to Dr. BRIGHT and Professor GILDERSLEEVE, to the former in his dedication, and to the latter in his chapter on "The Anglo-Saxon Absolute Participle as a Norm of Style"; and it is no disparagement of the pupil, while it is simple justice to his masters, to say that the influence of both is clearly perceptible in the production with which he makes his auspicious entry into the field of English scholarship.

ALBERT S. COOK.

*Yale University.*

#### SOME RECENT GERMAN TEXT-BOOKS.

The first volume among recent German books on our table which we wish to notice is SCHILLER'S 'Der Neffe als Onkel,' edited by Professor RADDATZ (Boston: Allyn & Bacon). The Introduction is short and to the point. This alone would do much toward influencing us in favor of the book. The notes are above the average quality, and a complete vocabulary is appended. Throughout, the reformed spelling has been used, and exceptions to the general rules for accentuation are marked by the acute accent. The little volume will be very acceptable, for no good edition of this comedy has hitherto been published in this country. Typography, binding, and general appearance do credit to the publishers.

HOFFMANN'S 'Historische Erzählungen,' edited by Mr. BERESFORD-WEBB (Boston:

D. C. Heath & Co.) will be a valuable addition to courses in historical prose. There are only four selections: "Conradin of Suabia," "The End of Charles the Bold," "The Execution of Louis XVI. and his Queen," and "The Franco-German War." They are written in a pure and easy style and are short enough to sustain the interest. The last extract, which contains thirty of the seventy pages of text, is undoubtedly the most attractive. A commendable feature of these "tales from history" is the "Index to Notes."

Mr. BABBITT'S edition of HOLBERG'S 'Niels Klim's Wallfahrt in die Unterwelt' (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.) will be found useful as a text-book for rapid reading or for sight translation with advanced students. It has been cut down so that it covers about sixty pages. We are glad that Mr. BABBITT has, as it may be said, introduced HOLBERG to the American public, for he is an author about whom we know too little. In Germany he became best known through his comedies, which GOTTSCHED recommended as models for the German stage, at the same time comparing them with the masterpieces of MOLIÈRE. The story under consideration was written at first in Latin. To use the words of the editor: "It contains a tremendous flagellation of various abuses in church and state, and aroused in its time a great deal of indignation on both sides." There is something so entertaining and fascinating in the narration that one is tempted to finish it at a single reading. We find many wise thoughts dropped here and there, among which the following will be of practical use to teachers: "Unter die Eigenschaften, die bei einem Schulmanne zur glücklichen Führung seines Berufs am meisten beitragen, gehört gewiss die Sanftmuth und Geduld. Denn sein ganzer Reichthum an gelehrten Kenntnissen hilft ihm nichts, wenn er nicht damit eine eiserne Geduld verbindet." All students will regret that Mr. BABBITT devotes less than a page to the elucidation of difficulties, of which there are not a few.

We can not refrain from saying a word in commendation of the 'German Scientific Monographs,' edited, with notes, by Professor SEIDENSTICKER (New York: Henry Holt & Co.). The first essay is Professor HELM-



HOLTZ' "Über Goethe's Naturwissenschaftliche Arbeiten"; the second Professor COHN'S "Über Bakterien." The selections are not purely technical, but have been written for "mixed audiences or popular publication." All technical words, as well as the peculiarities of German scientific composition, are explained in the notes.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

State University of Iowa.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

#### BOÏELLE'S EDITION OF 'BUG JARGAL.'\*

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—MR. BOÏELLE has succeeded in producing an edition of 'Bug-Jargal' (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, col. 56) that will add to his reputation as an editor and gain many friends for VICTOR HUGO in the class-room. This text could be used with profit as collateral reading in connection with PROFESSOR CRANE'S admirable volume, 'Le Romantisme français,' which contains only a short extract (about ten pages) from this romance. It may not be out of place to say that use of it in the class-room has confirmed the opinion that PROF. CRANE'S book is peculiarly adapted to awaken an interest in literary history.

Aware of the fact that there exists an inclination to be destructive rather than constructive in matters of scholarship, I do not wish to appear hypercritical, but a careful examination of MR. BOÏELLE'S notes brings out the following points which may be considered worthy of remark.

Page 1, line 17. "*Gambada de son mieux*, 'frolicked as best he could.' *Mieux* here, and not *meilleur*, because *manner* is understood." Just what the editor means to say in this note is not clear. The sentences given fail to explain the construction. In *de son mieux*, why not call *mieux* a noun and say that it corresponds to the English word *best* in such ex-

pressions as, 'to do one's best,' 'at one's best,' etc.?—P. 2, l. 25. "*Falloir* in the sense of 'to be wanting,' is only used with the particle *en* and the pronoun of the third person." This statement is partly incorrect; *falloir* may express 'to be wanting' without the particle *en*. For example, *il me faut un parapluie*, 'I want an umbrella' (literally, 'there is wanting to me an umbrella'). Cf. WHITNEY'S 'French Grammar,' p. 142.—P. 3, l. 2. Probably through an oversight the editor has failed to enclose the last part of this note in quotation marks; cf. BRACHET'S 'Etymological Dictionary' under *botte*.—P. 4, l. 26. The distinction made here between *trouble* and *peine* is excellent, viz.: *trouble*=English 'confusion'; *peine*=English 'trouble'.—P. 11, l. 5. The explanation, taken from LAVEAUX, of the use of *être* with *arriver* is clear and will be valuable to students. It is this: "*Arriver c'est littéralement toucher la rive, toucher au but de son voyage; être arrivé c'est être au but de son voyage. Ce n'est pas avoir fait une action, c'est un état.*"—P. 29, l. 16. The note is too sweeping, if WHITNEY is correct in his remarks under §138 of his Grammar.—P. 33, l. 12. "Adjectives used adverbially are invariable." *Tout* should be mentioned as an exception, in cases like the second example: *Elle est tout étonnée, elle est toute surprise*.—P. 36, l. 15. "*Il est plus malade que vous ne pensez*; but, *Il n'était pas aussi malade qu'il le disait* (not *ne le disait*, on account of the negative in the first clause)." The second sentence does not illustrate what MR. BOÏELLE wishes to explain.—P. 36, l. 20. "*After aussi, encore, toujours, peut-être, en vain, du moins, au moins*, the subject is *elegantly* placed after the verb in French." It is not easy to see how this order lends "elegance" to a sentence. It would have been appropriate to remark that this inversion may perhaps be traced back to the influence of the Teutonic invaders on French at the period of its formation.—P. 101, l. 4. In quoting from BRACHET a statement in regard to the etymology of *butor*, the editor fails to give the proper credit.—Misprints in the book are few.

CHARLES BUNDY WILSON.

State University of Iowa.

\*Bug-Jargal by VICTOR HUGO, edited for Schools and Colleges, with Life, Notes, etc.; by JAMES BOÏELLE, B. A. (Univ. Gall.), Senior French Master in Dulwich College. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1889. pp. xii, 226.

AND WHICH, BUT WHO.—BROWNING'S OBSCURITY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—May I jot down for your next issue two thoughts that come to me as I read your February number.

First—and, like the Hebraist, I will begin at the back of the book—I always supposed the rule for *and which, but who*, etc., to be that a relative clause requires the initial conjunction whenever, and only when, another relative clause or its equivalent (an adjective or participial clause) precedes it in the same construction. This rule has always served me, and, I believe, is the key to all doubtful cases.

Secondly, I stand aghast at a remark of President SHEPHERD's in his BROWNING paper. Conceding BROWNING's obscurity, Mr. SHEPHERD says, "Yet it is equally true that the poet is not wilfully, or even consciously obscure; the light that is in him is not darkness, though it sometimes lacks brilliance through imperfection in the transmitting medium." But, if the light that is in BROWNING is not darkness, and yet he is obscure, what becomes of BLAIR's rule that "whatever a man conceives clearly, it is in his power, if he will be at the trouble, . . . to express clearly to others"? Granted that this rule of BLAIR's says entirely too much, that some things are abstruse except to minds prepared to receive them; still it must be true that the expression, properly sifted, says these things and no others, leaves no doubt at last what was meant. But this is not true of BROWNING. There are things in him that "no fellow can find out." His obscurity may, indeed, be neither wilful nor conscious; but so much the worse for him. Is he like the average Sophomore, with one thing in his mind and another on his paper?

But Mr. SHEPHERD continues—"The noblest types of art, literary or plastic, do not reveal their full measure of rich suggestiveness to the merely casual student; the highest poetry is as much the appropriate subject of patient scrutiny and critical investigation as the science of mathematics or of astronomy. To most of us the high function of 'fathoming

the poet's mind' is not vouchsafed. The 'vision and the faculty divine' may see eye to eye, where we behold dimly and in figure." True, eternally true, indeed; but, unless all our former notions about the office of poet as *seer* are wrong, his duty is to behold what we may not discern, and to reveal all this to us so that we may make it out. He is the high priest of all these mysteries, entering the holy of holies, to be sure, where we may not follow him, but coming out again with a divine message for the people, God's peace and benediction, not a more tangled puzzle than was before us when we knelt humbly at the shrine, seeking light and guidance. This office of seeing and revealing has been the function of every poet since HOMER, every painter since PARRHASIUS, every sculptor since PHEIDON, every musician since JUBAL. Has this been Mr. BROWNING's office? I trow not.

JNO. G. R. McELROY.

University of Pennsylvania.

*Birut* IN TATIAN.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The temptation to connect *birut*, in Tatian cxxxviii, with *bēran* (MOD. LANG. NOTES, vol. v, p. 45) was strong, especially in view of the (superficial) analogy, in sense, between *hefige* and the English *hard*, in the phrase "bear hard." But upon reconsideration, I am constrained to give up the attempt. *Birut* is, I now admit, merely = *estis*, and comes under BRAUNE, § 379.

My remarks upon the verb *bēran* in general, however, may pass, I trust.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

BRIEF MENTION.

Messrs. Henry Holt & Co. have just issued a new edition, the sixth, of OTIS' 'Elementary German,' edited by Professor H. S. WHITE of Cornell University. The two parts of the former editions have been incorporated into one volume. The text has been carefully revised, the official orthography has been

adopted throughout, the vocabulary and index extended so as to cover both parts. Otherwise but slight alterations or emendations have been made. The chapter on the pronunciation still needs considerable attention. The mixed vowel should be kept entirely distinct from short *e* and it should be stated that it occurs not only in "an unaccented final syllable" (p. 5) but also in prefixes. There are not two but four varieties of "guttural" *g* (*ch*), two voiced and voiceless, comp. *König* and *Könige*. The wording of some paragraphs is not accurate enough; for example, p. 5, 1: "*b* and *d* are pronounced as in English when initial or when doubled; when final they have the sound of *p* and *t* respectively. Examples: *brechen*, *Stab*, *gehabt*, *habhaft*." Is *b* in *gehabt* final? If so, why not in *behäbig*? Of course the matter is clear enough to the instructor, but the student would be benefitted by more exact definitions. Unless the difference between English *sh* and German *sch* is pointed out, it would be better to teach only the North German pronunciation of *st* and *sp*; an English *sh* in these combinations produces a very undesirable sound. Nothing is said in regard to the pronunciation of initial *ch* and the wording of pp. 11, 14 would lead the student to think that it has the same sound in *Charakter* as in *China*. In many other details the book has been improved by a careful revision. New plates have been cast and the volume presents an attractive appearance. The publishers announce that they will also soon issue an edition printed entirely in German type, which will doubtless increase the popularity of this excellent little book with many teachers who still object to the use of Roman type.

It is becoming a more and more widely recognized principle that instruction in languages should be based from the very beginning upon the reading of connected prose instead of the fragments of sentences and short extracts such as we find in the text-books of former years. If in ordinary prose a certain word, form, or construction, occurs ten times more frequently than another, it is ten times more important that the student should be thoroughly familiar with the former than that he should know the latter. The tendency of

disconnected sentences made up or selected for the purpose of illustrating certain grammatical principles is invariably to change and sometimes even invert that proportion. The remedy is to be found in connected reading-matter selected solely for its general stylistic qualities. The new 'German Reader for Beginners' by Professor E. S. JOYNES (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.) has many desirable features. Compared with the one edited by Professor BRANDT lately noticed in these columns it is perhaps better adapted for younger pupils, as it contains a greater number of short and decidedly easy extracts, most of which are somewhat less modern in thought and style. The first part of the 'Reader' is made up of proverbs and simple fables with interlinear translation of such words as the pupil would not readily recognize, and explanatory foot-notes. The fundamental rules of the syntax are given at the bottom of the page in heavy type. The second part consists of "familiar prose," i. e., fables and a few of GRIMM's tales; the third part of short and easy poems, the fourth part of narrative prose for rapid reading; the fifth part of letters by HERDER, LESSING, SCHILLER, GOETHE, and VOSS, a number of them in script. There are numerous notes and a good vocabulary; in the latter the etymological cognates are not marked by the type. Unlike Professor BRANDT, Professor JOYNES refers only to his own grammar. On the whole, Professor JOYNES' 'Reader' will be found more serviceable for High-Schools, Professor BRANDT's for colleges.

As a supplement to Professor JOYNES' 'German Reader,' noticed above, WILHELM JENSEN's 'Braune Erica,' with notes by the same editor (D. C. Heath & Co., publishers) may be conveniently introduced. In the selections of German readings in his 'Reader' and the 'Braune Erica' for elementary students, Professor JOYNES has happily recognized the importance of carefully graded, and at the same time representative, matter for beginners in the language. The notes are not copious but cover most of the constructions offering serious difficulty. The editor has already anticipated a number of minor suggestions, which might be made here, for the new edition soon to appear.



'French and English: A Comparison,' by PHILIP GILBERT HAMERTON (Boston: Roberts Brothers), is a considerable expansion of the series of articles which appeared under the same title in the *Atlantic Monthly* during the years 1886 and 1887. The author long ago established his reputation as a penetrating and sympathetic observer of French manners and customs, in his charming work entitled 'Round my House.' The present essays are of a more general character, discoursing upon a range of topics to do justice to which requires a closely printed index of eighteen pages. As coming from a non-professional yet highly intelligent source, what MR. HAMERTON has to say on the present condition of modern language study in France and England, is not without interest. One or two passages are here quoted:—

In the present year (1888) the study of modern languages is better established in France than in England. It is obligatory in secondary education. Teachers in the *lycées* are required to be either *bacheliers des lettres* or to have a corresponding foreign degree, and it is hoped that before long the *licence des lettres* (equivalent to the English mastership) will be exacted. They have to pass a special linguistic examination for a certificate before they can teach in the *lycées*. This examination is a serious test, but it is much less severe than the competitive trial for the *agrégation*. The certificate gives the rank of a *licencié*, the *agrégation* that of a Fellow of the University. Every year the candidates are of a better class. M. BELJAME says that he knows thirty teachers of English who were already *licenciés*, and amongst the candidates in 1884 twelve had already taken that degree. In short, the teachers of modern languages are now rapidly assuming the same position in the University as the classical masters; and it is only just that they should do so, since they have the same general culture, and their special examinations are more searching. For example, the candidate for the *agrégation* has to lecture twice, before the examiners at the Sorbonne and in public, once in English and once in French (pp. 22-23).

The results of the improved teaching of modern languages have not yet had time to become visible in France. Teachers tell me that amongst their pupils a certain proportion show a natural taste and aptitude, and take heartily to their work. The rest count for nothing, and will retain only a limited vocabulary. In England some knowledge of modern languages is, as yet, much more general, but it seldom reaches the degree of what can be

seriously called "learning." The practical difficulty is that the unripe minds of young students, especially of young ladies, are not ready for the strongest books, and they take no interest in the history and development of a language, so they soon fall back upon the easy and amusing literature of the present, to the neglect of the great authors (pp. 23-24).

We desire to call the attention of our readers to two or three small works on the teaching of phonetics, both special and general. The title of 'Le Français parlé,' by PAUL PASSY, is already familiar to those who are interested in improved methods of presenting the science of French sounds to the non-French learner. The first edition of this useful little book was published in 1886 (Heilbronn; Gebr. Henniger) the second edition appeared last year and is a conscientious reworking of the material previously used, if we except a few short and unimportant pieces that have been cut out to make room for a good extract from the suggestive and instructive address of GASTON PARIS, "Les Parlers de France." The general plan followed by the author is to give the ordinary French script on the page to the left, and facing this the corresponding transcription in phonetic spelling, for which the characters here used vary slightly from the original edition in that the author has adopted the system used by the "Association phonétique des professeurs de langues vivantes," whose head-quarters are in Paris. The results of form and sound which are thus presented in Latin script, with only a few exceptions, belong strictly to the familiar speech, and, from this point of view may perhaps be criticized. Criticism, however, can bear here only on how far an author may go in making vulgar sound-products the subject of practical instruction—and this is a moot point on which scholars will probably never agree—but on the importance of this *kind* of representation, irrespective of individual demands and preferences, there can be no question. Were there no other merit in the treatise before us, the mere fact that in it the different qualities of *o*, *e*, *ai*, *a*, *au*, may be discriminated at a glance, is sufficient recommendation for its careful perusal by English-speaking students, who so often sin in giving these simple phonetic elements. As a matter of fact, however, this is only one of the many excel-

lences of the modest little book which, together with its companion-pieces, 'Phrases de tous les jours' by the lamented FELIX FRANKE, and the 'Fransk Læsebog' by O. JESPERSEN, is to be heartily recommended to instructors of French. Why should not some American teacher give us a like guide, worked out in the light of scientific phonetic method and adapted by its special practical features to our peculiar American needs?

Two small works, differing from the one just mentioned in their general scope, and dealing exclusively with sounds as such, are 'Visible Speech and Vocal Physiology,' 'Speech Reading and Articulation Teaching,' by Professor A. MELVILLE BELL, the 'father of scientific sound-notation and the veteran promulgator of numerous efforts to place the subject of phonetics upon a rational basis. It would probably not be over-stating the matter to assert that no other one of the master's larger works, not even his 'English Visible Speech for the Million,' will have done better missionary labor in behalf of phonetic reform than these two modest treatises before us, and this for a two-fold reason:—first, because of the greater simplicity of language here used and of the fuller illustration of the subject-matter; and, secondly, because of the lucid treatment of the organic symbols that so often seem enigmatic and bewildering to the ordinary beginner. The object of the first-named work, the author tells us in his preface, "is to popularize a knowledge of Vocal Physiology and Visible Speech and to furnish a text-book by means of which these subjects may be taught in schools and colleges." With this purpose in view, the technical difficulties of his former more scientific treatises have been carefully avoided and the details of the subject presented with a conciseness and accuracy, and with a logical sequence of elemental phenomena that must be both useful and attractive to the uninitiated in phonetic matters. The exercise in vowelizing consonants, to produce the corresponding vowels of the related phonetic series, will doubtless be especially interesting to the learner and teach him to discriminate clearly between consonant and vowel articulation. The second work mentioned above: 'Speech Reading, etc.,' is a model

of clearness and simplicity, without having any of the puzzling symbols that trouble the common mind. It was written at the suggestion of one of the most successful teachers of the Deaf, and, we regret to say, is regarded by the learned author as the last work which he shall write. As to lucid method, what can be clearer than the enunciation here given of the following processes of emission of breath?—

EMISSION takes place:—over back of tongue, German *ch* in *nach*;—over top of tongue, for *y* in *yes*;—over point of tongue, for *r* in *ray*;—between tip of tongue and teeth, for *th*;—over top and point of tongue, simultaneously, for *sh* and *s*;—over sides of tongue, for *l*;—between the lips, for *w*;—between lip and teeth, for *f*;—through the nose, for *m*, *n*, *ng*.

The exercises given here in speech-reading from the lips are especially interesting, and of great importance for the student of phonetics.

A monthly series of comedies, stories and society pieces in French, under the title of 'Edition Berlitz' (New York: Berlitz & Co; Boston: Schoenhof), is especially adapted to the wants of private schools and French clubs. The texts, without notes, for January and February of this year, are respectively: 'Le Retour du Japon,' a one-act comedy by DELACOUR and ERNY, and 'La Gifle' by DREYFUS, likewise in one act. Plays by VERCONSIN, LABICHE and MEILHAC will follow. The selections average thirty pages in length (25 cts. a number; \$2 for the subscription by the year.)

D. C. Heath & Co. have reprinted for use in this country DELBOS' edition of PIRON's 'La Métromanie.' The Introduction on the life and works of the author is supplemented by analyses of each act and by foot-notes. Experience has abundantly shown that all notes should come at the end of a text to prevent as far as possible slipshod ways of preparation (8vo, pp. 175, 40 cts).

GEORGE SAND's 'La Mare au Diable,' having been set for the examinations of the Normal Colleges in England, is edited by J. F. DAVIS (Hachette & Cie; Boston: Schoenhof). A short Introduction on the life of the author and the original Notice by GEORGE SAND are followed by the text in excellent

type, by abundant and conscientious notes, and by a vocabulary of less merit, (pp. vii, 165; 60 cts).

The same publishers offer from GUIZOT's 'History of France' the passage relating to the siege of Calais: 'Edouard III et les Bourgeois de Calais,' edited by the Rev. A. C. CLAPIN, M. A., with a map and illustrations. The object of the selection, according to the preface, is to introduce "to the study of ancient French authors," by means of the quotations GUIZOT makes from FROISSART. This somewhat roundabout way may perhaps lead a few wanderers to the truth. The subject is interesting, GUIZOT is entertaining, and the notes are good. 99 pp. 60 cts.

The New York *Home Journal*, an important feature of which is its timely discussion of current literature and art, has assumed a more youthful and attractive garb by folding its four-page "blanket" into eight. The *Journal* was founded nearly half a century ago by GEORGE P. MORRIS and N. P. WILLIS, and on the occasion of the recent change of form the present editor, Mr. MORRIS PHILLIPS, published an illustrated article of reminiscences devoted to these two well-known men of letters.

*Scribner's Magazine* for November 1889 has, pp. 552-572, "A student of Salamanca," by WILLIAM HENRY BISHOP; *ibidem*, January, we note "The Beauty of Spanish Women" by HENRY T. FINCK; the same magazine for February gives us "A Day in Literary Madrid" by WILLIAM HENRY BISHOP.—*Lippincott's Monthly Magazine* for December, 1889, pp. 821-830, has "The new Troubadours at Avignon" by the same author; *ibidem*, March, is given us "The Brownings in Italy" by ANNE H. WHARTON and "A Hint to Novelists" by W. H. STACKPOLE.—The *Fortnightly Review* for November, pp. 684-694, has "Folk-lore of Northern Portugal," by OSWALD CRAWFURD; *ibidem*, pp. 620-632, we note "Our Dramatists and their Literature," by GEORGE MOORE; *ibidem*, January, is found "Personal Recollections of Thomas Carlyle" by Professor TYNDALL.—The *Deutsche Rundschau* for November, pp. 289-296, contains "Wilhelm GRIMM's Deutsche Heldensage," by REINHOLD STEIG.—La *Nouvelle Revue* for

15th November, pp. 277-292, has an interesting study on the life of "Emile Augier," by LÉOPOLD LACOUR; *ibidem*, 1st November, pp. 102-120, "Les maitres de Lamartine," by CHARLES ALEXANDRE.—The *Educational Times* (London) for June, August, September, October, and November 1889, January and February 1890, contains a series of six interesting and important lectures on "Language and Linguistic Method in the School," by S. S. LAURIE, Prof. of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. The subjects treated are as follows: Language as the supreme Instrument of Education; Language as Substance of thought; Language as Substance of Instruction; The Formal or Grammar Discipline; Language as Literature; Method in teaching Foreign Languages. The January (1890) number of this journal has also a suggestive paper by W. H. WIDGERY "Class Teaching of Phonetics as a Preparation for the Pronunciation of Foreign Languages," read before the College of Preceptors, London, ALEXANDER J. ELLIS in the chair.

#### PERSONAL.

At their meeting on March 4, the Trustees of Rutgers College conferred on Professor T. W. HUNT of Princeton College the honorary degree of Doctor of Literature.—At a recent meeting of the Philadelphia Association of Ministers, Prof. HUNT read a paper on "Emerson as a Writer."

ALONZO WILLIAMS, Prof. of Modern Languages at Brown University, has been appointed supervisor of the Census for Rhode Island.

Professor MELVILLE B. ANDERSON, of the State University of Iowa, has just completed a series of successful public lectures at Davenport, Iowa, on the following subjects in English literature: 1, Aims, Methods, and Value of Literature; 2 and 3, Chaucer; 4, Spenser, 5 and 6, Shakespeare; 7, Bacon; 8, Milton; 9, Wordsworth and Shelley; 10, Robert Browning.

In the announcement of public lectures at Tulane University, New Orleans, we note two lectures by Prof. ALCÉE FORTIER on "The History of Comedy and Tragedy in France;" three lectures by Prof. JOHN R. FICKLEN on "The History of the Early Drama in England" (1, Mysteries and Miracles; 2, Moral Plays; 3, Rise of Romantic Literature); also six lectures by President WM. PRESTON JOHNSON on "SHAKESPEARE" (1, Method of Study of Shakespeare; 2, Macbeth; 3, The Significance of Hamlet; 4 and 5, The Evolution of Hamlet; 6, The Prototype of Hamlet).



## JOURNAL NOTICES.

**PHONETISCHE STUDIEN. III. BAND, I. HEFT.**—*Inhalt.*—Karsten, Gustaf, Sprechheiten und deren rolle in lautwandel und lautgesetz.—Victor, W., Beiträge zur statistik der aussprache des schriftdeutschen. IV.—Logeman, W. S., Darstellung des niederländischen lautsystems. (I.)—*Miscellen.*—Victor, W., Aus C. F. Hellwags nachlass. II.—Hoffman, H., Die unterrichtsreform auf neusprachlichem gebiete vom standpunkte eines taubstummenlehrers.—Kadler, Dr. Alfred, Eine kurze bemerkung über den grammatischen neusprachlichen unterricht in der prima.—*Sprechsaal für Phonetische Reform.*—Passy, Paul, Gegenvorschläge zu Kühns lautschrift.—Sueninghausen, W., Gegenvorschläge zu Kühns lautschrift.—*Rezensionen.*—Kauffmann, Friedrich, H. Morf, Die untersuchung lebender mundarten und ihre bedeutung für den akademischen unterricht.—Feyerabend, Karl, Karl Krumbach, Beiträge zur methodik der deutschen lese- und sprechübungen in den unteren klassen höherer lehranstalten.—Victor, W., Henry Sweet, A history of English sounds, from the earliest period.—Victor, W., Dr. G. Tanger, Englisches namenlexikon.—Kirschien, Dr. Fritz Tendering, Kurzgefasstes lehrbuch der englischen sprache.—Beyer, Franz, Wilh. Swoboda, Englische leselehre nach neuer methode.—Leveque, Ch. (d'Oisy), Paul Passy, Le français parlé.—Gutersohn, J., Dr. J. Americ und Th. de Beaux, Elementarbuch der französischen sprache.—Beyer, Franz, Paul Schumann, Französische lautlehre für mitteldeutsche.—*Erwiderungen.*—Sweet, Henry, Reply to Mr. MacLinton's Review.—M'Lintock, R., On Mr. Sweet's Reply.—*Notizen*, Litterarische nachrichten.—Schulreformvereine.—Nachtrag.

**NEUPHILOLOGISCHES CENTRALBLATT. NO. 2. FEBRUAR 1890.**—*Inhalt.*—Pilz, Oscar, Verhandlungen der neusprachlichen Section des Philologentags zu Götting.—Sachs, Über den Zusammenhang von Englisch und Französisch.—Stengel, Zur Abfassung einer Geschichte der französischen Grammatik.—Schaefer, Über den formalen Bildungswert des Französischen.—Koschwitz, Notwendigkeit der Berücksichtigung lauthistorischer Veränderungen bei syntaktischen Untersuchungen.—Cauer, Der Unterricht in Prima.—*Berichte aus den Vereinen.*—Berlin.—Cassel (Speyer, Mauzoni).—Hannover (Philippthal, Augier).—Lège (Reformvorschläge).—*Litteratur.*—Besprechungen Mueller, Th., Engl. Grm. [Tendering].—Nohl, Die Sprache des Niklas von Wyle [S-e].—Mann, Der Bestiaire Divin des Guillaume le Clerc [S-e].—Tinsau, Bouche close.—Ohnet, Dernier Amour [Sandmann].—Tennyson, Demeter.—Browning, Asolando.—Braddon, The Day Will Come.—Russell, Marooned.—Anstey, The Pariah).—*Neue Erscheinungen.*—Übersetzungen aus dem Deutschen; Österreichische neusprachliche Programme 1888-89 (Weiss).—Zeitschriften.—Verfügungen.—Personalien.—Stellen.—Anzeigen.

**GIORNALE STORICO. VOL. XIV. ANNO VII. FASC. 40-41.**—*Sommario.*—Adriano, Cappelli, La biblioteca Estense nella prima metà del sec. XV.—Costa, Emilio, Il codice parmense 1081. Appendice.—Sforza, Giovanni, Un episodio poco noto della vita di Aonio Paleario.—Valmaggi, Luigi, Per le fonti del "Cortegiano".—Köhler, Rainoldo, Illustrazioni comparative ad alcune novelle di Giovanni Sercambi.—I. De magna

prudencia.—Solerti, Angelo, Dei manoscritti di Torquato Tasso falsificati dal conte Mariano Alberti.—D'Ancona, Alessandro, Misteri e sacre rappresentazioni.—*Varietà.*—Graf, Arturo, Spigolature per la leggenda di Maometto.—Renier, Rodolfo, Per la cronologia e la composizione del "Libro de natura de amore" di Mario Equicola.—Saviotti, Alfredo, Di un codice musicale del sec. XVI.—Wendringer, Riccardo, Il "Ruffiano" del Dolce e la "Piaviana" del Ruzante.—Novati, Francesco, Per la biografia di Benvenuto da Imola.—*Rassegna Bibliografica.*—Gorra, Egidio, Il costume delle donne con un capitolo de le XXXIII bellezze, ed. S. Morpurgo.—*Bollettino bibliografico.*—Si parla di: O. Brentari.—G. Franciosi.—G. Finzi e L. Valmaggi.—K. Wotke.—G. Kirner.—T. Klette.—A. Baroni.—O. E. Schmidt.—R. Wendringer.—L. Fioravanti.—I. Mas-trigli.—P. de Nohao.—M. Vanni.—O. Antognoni.—G. Pitre.—*Comunicazioni ed appunti.*—Il "Giuseppe" del Collenuccio rappresentato a Ferrara nel 1504 (A. Gaspari).—Ancora di Domizio Brocardo (V. Rossi).—Polemica, Breve nota all'articolo del Macri-Leone (A. Gaspari) e Replica (F. Macri-Leone).—*Cronaca.*—**FASC. 42.**—*Sommario.*—Tocco, Felice, Il fior di rettorica e le sue principali redazioni secondo i codici fiorentini.—Luzio, Alessandro, Nuove ricerche sul Folengo (continuaz. e fine).—*Varietà.*—Villari, Pasquale, Una lettera del Savonarola a Lodovico il Moro.—*Pellegrini, Flaminio*, Le chiese all' "Inferno" edite da F. Selmi e il cod. Marc. ital. el. IX, n. 179. **Sforza, Giovanni**, Girolamo Gigli e l'Accademia degli Oscuri di Lucca. *Rassegna Bibliografica.*—*Gaspari, Adolfo*, Il cantare di Florio e Bianciflore, ed. V. Crescini, vol. I.—*Renier, Rodolfo*, Luigi Amaduzzi, Undici lettere inedite di Veronica Gamba e un'ode latina tradotta in volgare.—*Bollettino bibliografico.*—Si parla di: E. Michael.—C. Beccaria.—B. Cotronei.—G. Lumbroso.—V. Caravelli.—C. Antona-Traversi.—*Comunicazioni ed appunti.*—Dante e il Petrarca (F. Novati).—*Cronaca.*—Indice alfabetico della rassegna, del bollettino e degli annunci analitici.

**NORDISK TIDSKRIFT FÖR VETENSKAP, KONST OCH INDUSTRI. NEW SERIES. PART I.**—Schueck, Henrik, "Foremmed indflydelse paa den danske nationallitteratur i det 17 og 18 aarhundrede" of J. Paxaludan.—**PART II.**—Kälund, Kr., "Privatboligen på Island i Sagatiden samt delvis i det øvrige Norden" af V. Guðmundsson.—**PART IV.**—Steffen, Richard, några germanska myter i ny belysning.—*Nyrop, Kr.*, Enniddelalderlig skik.

**NORDISK TIDSKRIFT FÖR FILOLOGI. NEW SERIES. VOL. IX. PART III.**—Kock, Alex., Svenska konsonantstudier. IV.

**ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEN DEUTSCHEN UNTERRICHT. VOL. 4. NO. I.**—Kade, R., Zur Textkritik des Prinzen von Homburg.—Seehus, F., Die Bibel und das Volk.—Ondrusch, K., Form und Konstruktion des attributiven und prädikativen 'voll'.—Schmerl, M., Der Bau von Schillers Maria Stuart.—Gloel, H., Die dramatische Handlung von Goethes Egmont.—Schmidt, C., Wie lässt sich das Gotische für den deutschen Unterricht an unseren Höheren Schulen nutzbar machen?—Hildebrand, R., Eine merkwürdigkeit aus Goethes Grammatik.—Lyon, O., Eichendorffs "Der Jäger Abschied".—Sprechzimmer.—*Recensionen.*—Zeitschriften.—Neue Bücher.—